

The Falsification of German History

By

Wilhelm Kammeier

1935

Adolf Klein Verlag, Leipzig S 3 [Publisher, location]

Table of contents

For the journey

Translator's address

Book 1: The falsification of the diplomatical sources of the German Middle Ages **p. 7-82**

Foreword: The big question

- 1. Chapter: Introduction. Expert historians among themselves**
- 2. Chapter: Old documents and old document critique**
- 3. Chapter: Number, originator and purpose of the medieval document forgeries**
- 4. Chapter: Local and regional forgeries. Potential of a universal forgery action**
- 5. Chapter: The medieval forgeries do not stem from 'practical' forgers**
- 6. Chapter: The peculiar mental state of medieval forgers**
- 7. Chapter: "Stupidity as the most reliable of all explanations"**
- 8. Chapter: More proof for the alleged retardedness of medieval document scribes**
- 9. Chapter: The root cause of the chronological muddle in the medieval documents**

Book 2: The falsification o/t narrating historical sources **p. 83-160**

Bridge

- 1. Chapter: Two predecessors**
- 2. Chapter: The method of sound common [human] sense**
- 3. Chapter: Double documents and re-issues of documents**
- 4. Chapter: Addenda [late entries] and gaps in the dating**

5. Chapter: Isolated 'practical' forgeries or uniform 'learned' forgery action?
6. Chapter: Purpose of diplomatical letters/signs
7. Chapter: The literary side of the tradition. Parallel falsification
8. Chapter: The loss statistics of medieval scripts as proof of the destruction of the genuine tradition
9. Chapter: Forgery technique and forgery 'black marks' in narrating sources
10. Chapter: "Multiple-entry book-keeping" as forgery tactics

Book 3: ROME as the originator of the forgery action p 161-230

Bridge

1. Chapter: Mystery of the Franconian History of the Kings
2. Chapter: EINHARD's Life of CHARLES THE GREAT
3. Chapter: The forged medieval registries of the popes
4. Chapter: The lack of secular registries and archives
5. Chapter: ROME as headquarters of the medieval forgery action
6. Chapter: The point in time/timespan of the forgery action

Book 4: The Roman fairy tale o/t barbarianism o/t Germans p 231-282

Bridge

Chapter 1: The originators of the forgery action

Chapter 2: The legal history as witness to the forgery action

Chapter 3: The falsification of TACITUS' *GERMANIA*

Chapter 4: The Roman fairy tale of the barbarianism of the Germans

Chapter 5: The invention of HENRY IV's march of penance to CANOSSA

For the journey

"[...] under the condition that [...] the truth remains more valuable than the lie, and that will be the case for as long as there are Germans in the world." (KAMMEIER in *THE TRUTH OF THE HISTORY OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES* (1940), Book III, Chapter 1)

Translator's address

Welcome dear reader.

To get one thing out of the way first: I am no professional translator. (How close I might be to becoming one, is of no concern – my person is in no way important in this.)

Now, that you are nonetheless faced with the result of me tackling the task of preparing KAMMEIER's works for the English-speaking world, is based on the fact that there is probably only an extremely small number of people in the world who even know of his work at all.

Also, in the event that you imagine this to be all about Germany, let me put your mind at rest: it is not. The (translated) titles may give you an idea as to the scope of KAMMEIER's work. He was originally a teacher, i.e. as a historian an auto-didact (=self-learner), much as I am as a translator, only aeons ahead in comparison – the volumes this man must have read...

KAMMEIER, WILHELM – *THE FALSIFICATION OF GERMAN HISTORY* (1935)

KAMMEIER, WILHELM – *THE TRUTH OF THE HISTORY OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES* (1940)

KAMMEIER, WILHELM – *THE FALSIFICATION O/T HISTORY OF PRIMEVAL CHRISTIANITY* (1942-56)

You will likely find the odd typo (I did the proof-reading twice only), or some peculiar wording (some of which stems from the original), so: please, cut me some slack, try to bear with me (and KAMMEIER), and hopefully, you will find that it was worth it. Since there was no dictionary on palaeographic, theological or even historical terminology available, may the reader show clemency with my amateurish descriptive translations, and understand the heart of the affair, nonetheless. Most of it should not present any cause to any misunderstanding – that was one of my prime objectives during translation.

If you would like to edit – edit away, possibly in cooperation with me. It's not a condition, though. 'Copyright' is for shmucks, putzes and other assorted devil-worshippers, just so long as this piece will be available in English somehow.

As already hinted: this is meant to be a friendly (towards KAMMEIER), not a hostile translation.

Finally: everything in square brackets [...] is me patronising you, everything else as close to the original in terms of meaning, spirit and style as my perception, skills, understanding of

the scientific aspect, my encyclopedia and dictionaries permitted. Proper names, except run-of-the-mill adjectives such as 'German', will be printed in THIS STYLE, titles of works in *THIS STYLE*. KAMMEIER used *endnotes*, that leaves me the *footnotes* for making excuses, or further patronising you.

Now, enough of me, and thank you for your kind attention.

Friedrich August Wilhelm Erxleben d.J.

Swindon (UK), July '2022'

P.S.: All three of KAMMEIER's works (both books and audio books) are part of the so-called *NSL ARCHIV*, a 162 GB data collection, containing just under 2500 books/collections, plus countless hours of film footage (some feature length films) and music, originally published online by 'unglaublichkeiten.com' at the beginning of the '21st' century. It can still be downloaded from 'archive.org'. Enter 'NSL Archiv' or 'unglaublichkeiten.com' in the search on archive.org. Although the bulk of it is in German, there are specific folders with English, French, Italian, Spanish items, and then some.

P.P.S.: It may be that I am just too stupid for words, but KAMMEIER, whose approach seems to be beyond reproach, has convinced me comprehensively. At any rate, sufficiently for me to skip the usual reference-checking – after all, **time** is of the essence. That is what I think. And thus I will act!

It may also well be that there aren't many people at all who can even begin to fathom the magnitude of significance in KAMMEIER's work.

P.P.P.S.: Just so there are no misunderstandings:

0%

That is the part of the translation performed by translation 'software', which will NEVER be able to grasp the fineties (lol) of language.

Book 1

The falsification of the diplomatical sources of the German Middle Ages

Foreword

The Big Question

How is it explained that "over the Germanic beginnings lies a darkness compared to which the beginnings of ROME and HELLAS are of bright clarity?" (MOMMSEN)

How is it explained that our ancestors allegedly did not know writing in order to put down on paper their life experiences, at a time when ROME had a CAESAR, a VIRGIL and an AUGUSTUS?

For what are the Germanic 'hero songs' to be taken which were allegedly collected by the Franconian King CHARLES and, also allegedly, destroyed by LUDWIG THE PIOUS? Are those 'songs' perhaps supposed to have been old-German history sources?

In order to answer these burning questions, this book has been written which herewith presents its first part.

1.

Introduction. Expert historians among themselves.

If expert historians nowadays complain: "Thus is the tragedy of the situation of modern historical science that it is not judged by its very own works, and not by scientific method, either" ¹, the experts can credit themselves with the existence of such a tragic situation. First off, because they are cautiously trying to prevent 'outsiders' to meddle in their 'internal professional work'. They offer the educated amateur results over results, but can't bring themselves to letting them have a peek into their workshop, and to letting them know by what method and with which tools they arrived at those results. But more than ever before, *this* is exactly what especially the historically interested educated amateur is after; because since the great National Socialist turn, the consciousness of the past of our People is no longer merely a guild affair of a small number of experts but has become a heart's affair for every member of the German Nation. [orig. 'Volksgenosse'] And ever stronger, one perception is surfacing among our People: there is something not quite right with the old German history, the way it has been taught to us. Doubts are emerging concerning the entire history of the German Middle Ages, but especially with regards to the reports about the beginnings and the cultural development stage of our ancestors which were handed down to us by foreign history scribes of antiquity.

With those doubts, if one turns to the men who are professionally concerned with the research of old German history, one meets shrugging shoulders and an explanation to this effect: the cage that is the great building of medieval history, the way it stands there like an iron construction, must under no circumstance be rattled. The monstrous historical structure is founded upon flawless, solid ashlars, namely upon the historical sources preserved for us.

In the last hundred years, the ashlar, the historical sources, have been examined so often, so thoroughly, and with such exact methods, that after elimination of a small fraction acknowledged as to be not genuine, no further doubt as to the authenticity of the main body is permitted anymore. Thus, the building of the history of medieval Germany stands unimpeachable.

At this point already, it dawns on us: if we want to reach clarity on the justification of those ever growing doubts, we have to direct our entire attention to the *sources* of the medieval tradition. Now, in doing so, it will be inevitable that we examine first and foremost the *methods* employed by our historians when examining the sources for authenticity. Whether we want it or not, we have to go to the expert into his workshop. After all, it makes sense that with inferior or even wrong methods, the examination for authenticity or non-authenticity of the historical sources has to turn out dubious or wrong results.

So, let us zoom in on the expert scholars at work. A glance at the historical papers of the last decade reveals to us the educational fact that the source researchers, when it comes to the deployment of their methods, are in no way in agreement. All too often, they get in each other's hair especially over methodical issues. This is not exactly supporting the idea of the glorified rocksolid security of their method, and thus their results. Let us begin with an example of the most recent times. In 1927, SCHMEIDLER published his book *HENRY IV. AND HIS HELPERS IN THE INVESTITIVE CONTEST*. By way of the method employed by him, which he calls "my great help and magical potion" – it consists of a critical comparison of stylistic peculiarities in the medieval documents – SCHMEIDLER arrived at certain novel results. Right away, two other researchers proved to him, by way of *their* method, that his methodical magical potion "lead him to far-reaching mistakes"². The following case has unfolded in dramatic turns³: The Central Board of Directors of the *MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA* – this is the place that has made it its task to present the source writings of the medieval

German history in exemplary appearance – was supposed to publish the Legal Codex of the Salian Franconians, the so-called *LEX SALICA*. The researcher entrusted with the editing, via his method, arrived at certain results which were already accepted by the experts of the Central Board of Directors, "by men of the highest authority and expertise". There rose, from the ranks of the expert colleagues, the most vehement protest against the published results. Even the Reich's Government had to intervene in this situation which was growing ever more embarrassing; allegedly, these "wayward findings" are also to be blamed on organisational shortcomings in the structure of the *MONUMENTA*. However, in reality, the affair presents itself thus: the root cause of the mistakes is not to be found in externals, namely the structure of the expert society people, but in the examination method with which one, just so long as *several* researchers are working on the very same subject, depending on the kind of deployment, *has to* arrive at varying results.

The same game was repeated over the new edition of the *LEX BAJUWARIORUM* by VON SCHWIND. "Even before being published, the edition has been subjected to devastating criticism in the book by KRUSCH."⁴ Another example concerns the edition of the *FULDA ANNALS* for which the commissioned researcher was furnished with equally sharp criticism. He is accused of "arguing with hypothesis [plural], one of which is called upon to support the other".⁵ The thus accused defends himself against his critic with the response: "Whoever believes him in that may consider me indeed ripe for the insane asylum."⁶ In his work on the *CHRONICLES OF THIETMAR OF MERSEBURG*, HOLTZMANN writes about an earlier editor of the same Chronicles with regards to his results: "This cannot be called science anymore... This is where phantasy begins."⁷ In the *HISTORISCHE VIERTELJAHRESCHRIFT* [*HISTORICAL QUARTERLY*], an expert accuses a colleague, one would have to wonder "over his risky explanations", he "tackled a task to which his method of critique did not rise."⁸ We hear the

same accusation coming from GÜTERBOCK against his predecessor IAFFÉ in the way that he follows "methodical dead-ends".⁹

It is this fatal shakiness in the results that lets us view the nowadays usual methods with justified suspicion, and now, already, we listen with much scepticism when an expert, with regards to his method, talks of "razor-sharp instruments" and the "sparkling shiny tool of diplomatics".¹⁰ Soon, we will meet all of the dullness and complete unfitness of this in truth very rusty tool in sufficient examples. Now, when the same expert goes to proclaim with dry face: "Examinations on source research are no lecture for the educated amateur"¹¹, we then find this warning ridiculous, and we, surprised as we are, hear ourselves ask: But why not? Why is the non-expert, who has his common sense about them just as much, shut out from this realm? Is the wisdom of historical research so bottomlessly deep? Does such important research, so important for the German People, after all, have anything to do with higher and highest mathematics in which, as you know, not every educated human being is versed? Oh no, for this research, all the amateur needs is a grasp of elementary mathematics, nay, he only needs to be able to count up to 10, but no more than up to 50 at the most; have they learned that, they will be able to follow the course of the examinations with any level of Joe-Blog-smarts easily and comfortably. (Why however, they have to be able to count up to 50, we will soon see, to our great surprise, during the course of these examinations.) It seems to me that the cautious exclusion of outsiders from the observation of the works of historical source research may well be, quite subconsciously, caused also by the embarrassing feeling that the amateur, during *his* examination, could recognise the rotten foundations of the medieval historical building and its many cracks and chips. And indeed, the reader of the following chapters will go from one shock to another once they realise what it is that has been brought to light as truth about our medieval history by way of those "sparkling shiny tools" of source research. Now, even experts are, by and by, beginning to feel uneasy in the face of these

shaky results. BLOCH, for example, hints as much when, in his report on the mentioned ongoing caused by the edition of the *LEX SALICA*, he regrets the events with regards to "the wide pool of expert colleagues who accept these results on the basis of the confidence in the achievements of the *MONUMENTA GERMANIAE*."¹² Occasionally, "the imperfection of our research method" is openly admitted.¹³ STACH even calls the resulting state of affairs caused by the examination of the *LEX BAJUWARIORUM* a "Babylonian method chaos".¹⁴

At this point, I have to counter an accusation that might be addressed to me. I was forced to hint at the state of affairs of the lauded "exact" method of historical source research; but it was far from me wanting to belittle the German Historical researchers, or to minimise their achievements. A thorough treatment of the works of these men forces me to admit: the German source researchers, for a hundred years, have achieved great things in meticulously detailed work. Why, without the tireless efforts of these men, the sheer endless amounts of sources of medieval tradition would appear as a chaotic pile of rubble even today. The failures in the realm of source research are not to be attributed to a lack of good will on these researchers' part, but found their ultimate cause in the methods they employed. To prove this, is the purpose of this book.

2.

Old documents and old document critique

All historical research has but one big goal: to determine what is historically true. Now, since a certain category of characters will have the question of PILATE on their lips: and what is truth? it requires an explanation as to what is actually meant by historical truth, or, to put it more accurately: in the realm of historical questions, only in what sense and to what scope can reference be made to the truth? To clarify, it may help to mention that the truth with regards to a historical person and their workings can be established only within quite a certain, sharp limitation. We will never be able to establish with absolute certainty from what motives a person from the past really ultimately acted. Neither will all historians ever reach an agreement on the big complex of questions on the *evaluation* of historical personalities and events. However, this side of historical truth is quite irrelevant to us here. Because in no way are we undertaking an evaluation of historical persons or events, but what alone needs answering instead in each of the later mentioned cases are questions as to the *actuality*, the historical *factuality* of a person or event. With every traditional personality reported to us, the question is whether that person is historically true, real, authentic, whether they actually existed, or perhaps have been invented; furthermore, whether the traditional events reported to us actually took place, or took place in the way that the tradition is describing them to us. In this sense – simply understood as objective fact – historical truth, as we will see, is very well researchable.

If we now ask the expert what is, in any given case, historically true and real, he will reply concisely: true is what is founded upon authentic historical sources. We agree with this answer. In it, two things are expressed: firstly, that the researcher has to probe his way

through all the scrub right through to the source, and secondly, that the truth of any event is guaranteed only if the found source turns out to be authentic.

What are historical sources? If we leave aside all non-written evidence, as being outside of our framework, we say: in research, what is called a "*source*", is the *chronologically first*, or, also, in terms of space, the closest written record of an event. Now, the enormous mass of all historical sources can be separated into *two main groups*; the one group contains the so-called "*literary*", the other the "*diplomatical*" sources. Literary sources are all chronicles and narrating descriptions by historical authors. Diplomatical sources are considered to be those historical writings which are called documents, and whose peculiarity is characterised by – contrary to the freely designed chronicles – having emerged under the force of deeply rooted chancery habits. Diplomatical sources are also those writings by official offices called files, protocols etc. For the determination of historical truth, diplomatical sources, with good cause, are preferred choice, and this preference lies in the method by which these documents were produced.

A writing which has been given the importance of a document has always been given particular care when being produced. The medieval originators of documents, too – as such, almost exclusively, popes and the higher cleric, and also emperors and kings, qualify – had already furnished a special institution for the production of documents: the chancery. Its employees – the notaries and scribes – had to produce the diplomatical writings observing prescribed rules. The documents would receive a tinge of individuality by the fact that, with regards to the wording of the text as well as their external appearance, under changing time periods, individual chanceries would have individual habits in terms of the forms used and the process of production. Naturally, the documents would be signed, and mostly sealed, by the originator's order receiver in the Middle Ages, too; for even back then, documents were, just like nowadays, used as evidence, and that could only happen when the document would

be able to verify itself as a *genuine* record by quite individual attributes such as seal and signature. Why, in order to guarantee the authenticity further, it was a habit in early medieval chanceries to place on the document certain individually shaped and most peculiar looking flourishes: the so-called chrism and the recognition sign. The medieval document was also furnished with location and date.

In the older times, *recipients* of documents were monasteries, churches and founders/donors, only much later, secular persons and communities are to be found as recipients. All diplomatical writings, since one had a powerful weapon in their hands in case of legal struggles, were carefully stored: in the archives of the monasteries etc.

The branch of historical science whose representatives are concerned with the critical examination of the entire mass of documents, is called *diplomatics*, and thus, the document researcher is called a diplomatist. This name stems from the term diploma, denoting a document.

Our modern scientific document critique has grown from a desire of practical life: during the 16th and 17th century, the documents presented as pieces of evidence in court trials gave cause to obtain assessments on authenticity/non-authenticity of a diploma from experts. In the early years of diplomatist critique, the history of diplomatics recorded such exceedingly educational examples that we have to briefly concern ourselves with them. We will find, without being at all surprised anymore actually, what we found in the first chapter with regards to the shaky results of the modern [contemporary] colleagues: the old diplomatists, with their methods as much, arrived at results which contradicted each other with consistent malevolence. The Jesuit PAPEBROCH (born 1628 to Antwerp) was one of the first to make an effort in establishing fixed rules for the critical examination of documents. In his work, he lists attributes which, in his opinion, have to be considered criteria of authentic

documents, and, on the basis of the rules he proclaimed, arrives at condemning almost the entire stock of medieval documents as forgeries. The point of this devastating judgement was aimed mainly at the vast document treasures of the BENEDICTINE monasteries. And so, it was from that side that the glove was taken up, too. PAPEBROCH suffered a thorough snubbing; why, he had to even be told that he had the misfortune to found his claims on just those documents which were forgeries themselves! In this document struggle, the BENEDICTINES found in one member of the order, the famous MABILLON, an extraordinarily versed researcher and defender. From this "father of diplomatics" originates the first actual work on scientific document critique.

Soon however, tables were turning again. Only a few decades later, opposition rose against MABILLON as well, the GERMONISTS – so called after their leader, the Jesuit GERMON – who again declared all older documents to be forged fabrications, and all diplomatical rules which MABILLON derived from them as utterly worthless. And now again – enter MABILLON's fellow members of the order. In the congregation ST. MAUR, a whole body of diplomatist experts joined with the objective to once again, in all thoroughness, carry out the comprehensive examination of the old documents. In the years 1750-1756, as the fruit of such associate research, the six-volume work *NOUVEAU TRAITÉ DE DIPLOMATIQUE* was published. And what came of that work, in terms of novelty and certainty? With a flood of words, these Maurians [from ST. MAUR] say the same thing that their great predecessor expressed briefly and concisely. There can't be any mention of an absolutely certain method with them, either. One fact is remarkable. These are no independent experts to whom we owe the foundation of diplomatical science; nor were there purely scientific considerations that gave the first impulse, but diplomatics sprung from very practical motives. That of course applies to all sciences, but no scientific subject is as much lumbered with genetic defects and infirmities, brought on "by birth and practical purpose", as is the science of history, and especially

diplomats. However, once again we highlight the fact that from the first beginnings of diplomatics up to our time, all employed examination methods show the peculiar attribute that they lead to results contradicting each other.

3.

Number, originator and purpose of the medieval document forgeries

All historical sources possess historical value only if their authenticity is guaranteed. That applies to diplomatical documents as much as it does to literary sources. Therefore, beginning with MABILLON, the great task of the diplomatists has been the examination of the medieval diplomas for their authenticity. Now, in mentioning PAPEBROCH, we have, for the first time, heard of unauthentic, i.e. forged documents. Why, PAPEBROCH declared almost the entire stock of old medieval documents to be unauthentic. His opponents found with *their* method that, quite to the contrary, it was just those documents that were forgeries which PAPEBROCH had declared to be authentic. Now, let us just skip the interval, and ask the nowadays researcher: have you, too, with your new, clean methods, detected document forgeries? And how many? And how do you work out the coming about of those forgeries?

It is necessary to prepare the reader a little. He will hear of amazing things. The fact that *document forgeries* occurred in the Middle Ages, shouldn't have escaped any educated human being. Without getting particularly upset, the amateur is in the habit of registering the fact, especially because he imagines the number of forgery cases to be the rarest of rarities,

like a white raven amongst a big flock of black birds. But he will scratch his head in doubt when he now hears of the following examples and figures which are presented as a small selection of the publications of the last decades.

H BRESSLAU¹⁵ gives us an overview by percentage: "Of the diplomas of the MEROVINGIANS passed down to us, almost 50%, of the first four CAROLINGIANS around 15%, of those of the first SAXON kings around 10% are forged." – H HOFFMANN¹⁶ gives the following overview: "Of the 262 diplomas of the Emperor (CHARLES THE GREAT), no less than 98, i.e. almost two fifth, are completely forged." He lists further: "in the name of HENRY I. 2, OTTO I. 31, OTTO II. 8, OTTO III. 13, HENRY II. 25, KONRAD II. 13 diplomas" are forgeries. – Same place, different page, we also find out: The entirety of the CAROLINGIAN diplomas of the OSNABRÜCK bishopric (these are 8) and another 2 diplomas of OTTO I. from there are forgeries.¹⁷ – "Of the 12 oldest GANDERSHEIM diplomas, 7 are falsified"¹⁸. – "Of the way over 100 documents, mostly of the 11th and 12th century" (these are predominantly PASSAU bishopric documents) "nearing 50 [...] have been [...] proven forged or tampered with."¹⁹ – Of 13 older diplomas of the KLINGENMÜNSTER monastery, 9 are forgeries.²⁰ – HARTUNG sifts through the older stock of documents of several important monasteries and churches, and speaks with regards to HERSFELD, GANDERSHEIM, HAMBURG-BREMEN, CORVEY, QUEDLINBURG, PFÄVERS, STABLO etc. of an unbelievable number of forgeries.²¹ - In Volume 37 of the *NEUES ARCHIV* alone, the following cases of forgery are listed: p 325 (the GRADENSIAAN forgeries), p 369 (the document forgeries of the abbot BERNHARD BUCHINGER), p 370 (forgeries in the abbeys OBER- und NIEDERMÜNSTER), p 145 (unauthentic PASSAU bishopric diplomas), p 871 (forged Imperial diploma for AQUILEA). – Volume 48 of the *NEUES ARCHIV* reports the following cases: p 253 (forgery for HAMM IN WESTPHALIA), p 275 (forgeries of the monasteries MURI and ENGELBERG), p 282 (REINHARDTSBRUNN forgeries and forgeries in the ST. BLASIEN-NORTHEIM monastery), p 284 (document forgeries of the

monastery ABDINGHOF in PADERBORN and forgeries of the FULDA monastery), p 289 (forged letters in LITHUANIA), p 422 (forgeries in the BAMBERG monasteries PRÜFENING and GLEINK). This list of so far detected document forgeries could be extended for some time, and, should it get completed, would fill a small volume of forgery cases.

Geographically speaking, the forgeries spread across all the important places of catholic-medieval Germany. It is indeed thus: a medieval monastery, an important church in which *no* forgeries would be found, would be an exception and as rare as a white hart. Our small list already gives the claims of PAPEBROCH and the GERMONISTS, through the research of our very newest diplomatics, a degree of confirmation that gives cause to reflection.

The reader's amazement is growing further still when he now has to find out just what *persons*, in the Middle Ages, were so expeditiously concerned with the fabrication of forged documents. Document forgeries have always been stigmatised as contemptible acts of deceit, and a pious, honest Christian – on that, there is only one opinion – would never be able to bring themselves to such deed. However, what is one supposed to say now that modern diplomatics has established that as forgers, and that is in the oldest times alone – because back then, only church institutions qualified as recipients of diplomas at all – but also in the later Middle Ages, to a significant proportion, servants of the church qualify? On this, I let H BRESLAU²² do the talking; he says: "It is undeniable that even the most splendid men of the church, clerics whose piety and righteous way of life is much praised [...], inasmuch as they used theft and lie in order to obtain possession of honoured and miracle-working relics, they took refuge to forgery and deceit when the task was to increase or defend the possessions, the rights, the image of their church. It is the principle that the end justifies the means which taught even such, simply contemptible, means to be regarded as permitted: for within the church, the majority of the clerics' highest goal in life was to lift, to enrich the power and the

honour of the church with which they had their first personal affiliation. Often, entire series of documents have been forged to such ends."

It is no use that we stubbornly refuse to believe such things – pious Christians: forgers and fraudsters? – every diplomatist tells us with distinct certainty that this, indeed, was the case. And as has been said before, the fabrication of falsified documents by medieval servants of the church by no means represent individual occurrences, nay, through all centuries of the Middle Ages and through all areas of EUROPE, document forgeries by clerics can be traced in abundance. Indeed, it hits the heart of the affair, when another diplomatist comments on the disposition of the clerics of the Middle Ages with regards to the case examined by him²³:

"Nothing lay closer than the fabrication of forged documents." In the Middle Ages, whenever some monastery felt threatened in their possessions, or had designs on increasing them – then always, "nothing" lay "closer" than fabricating forged documents! Since the fact cannot be denied away, our researchers have, in simple and cheap fashion, already accepted this problem with resignation. What E STENGEL²⁴ says concerning the clerical forger RUDOLF OF FULDA, can be taken for the diplomatists' general opinion on this point: "Who wants to be his moral master for this? Long has one learned to calmly accept document forgery as a characteristic expression of the way of thinking and fighting of an era with a naive and strong perception." About all of this, the educated amateur will shake his head in wonder, he will shout to himself again and again: something is not right here. And so, *one* voice from the choir of diplomatists then goes to proclaim that "truth and lie in the Middle Ages did experience no different judgement to that of ours of today."²⁵ It is the learned JESUIT W M PEITZ who speaks thus, and with whose diplomatical research we will have to deal at length later.

It goes without saying that, even in the Middle Ages, no man would have signed up for the arduous task of forging documents without quite a certain *purpose*. We have just

heard that – at least for the early Middle Ages – exclusively clerics qualify as forgers, and their acts of deceit were to serve the purposes of their particular community: bishopric, monastery, church. Their intention was aimed at surreptitiously obtaining certain advantages, free abbot election, exemption from personal and material chores, limitation of the powers of stewards of the convents etc. Assuming for a moment that diplomatics had uncovered irrefutable facts – which unfortunately, as we know, is not the case – then all those many forgeries from the Middle Ages would have sprung from egotistical-materialistic motives, and with the *practical* purpose of surreptitiously obtaining advantages. This point, we have to stress particularly. After all, the entire reasoning of this book revolves around the again and again emerging question: *Are the medieval document forgeries really to be considered practical forgeries?* Did they really serve, as is taken for granted by the researchers, serve as momentary practical purposes of a monastery etc.? At this point, this line of questioning will trigger amazement, perhaps alienation. One will respond: why on EARTH should the servants of the church have resorted to the means of forgery at all? The big problem, herewith hinted at for the first time, culminates in the following consideration: do the discovered document forgeries even stem from the different centuries of the Middle Ages at all? Were in the 9th, 10th, 11th etc. century the living inmates of the monasteries the originators at all? Once again: Are the medieval document forgeries really to be considered practical forgeries?

4.

Local and regional forgeries. Potential of a universal forgery action

The diplomatical experts claim that THEODOR VON SICKEL was the first to succeed, "via necessarily convincing thought", in guiding the diplomatical science "out of the vicious circle in which it was moving". So, it is admitted that the diplomatical science was puffing itself out in fatal circular reasoning. Of what does SICKEL's method consist now? SICKEL's starting point was the finding: rules of critique can be obtained only from *genuine* documents. (For there are many diplomatical pieces which have only been preserved as copies.) Thus, his task was to find a criteria which enables the researcher to decide with absolute certainty whether a document is genuine or not.

And indeed, SICKEL found a seemingly useful criteria. The hand-writings of different people are very different. In the general conduct [orig. 'Duktus'], in the shaping and composition of individual letters, in less or more pressure [on the pen/paper], every hand-writing shows individual hallmarks. Thus, if several writings of a person are mixed in with the writings of others, it will not be difficult, with a little practice, to separate the writings of that person via their graphical peculiarities. If we imagine this examination process applied to the document stock of a medieval chancery, we are in a position to determine all scribes once active in that chancery, including the pieces which each of them has produced. And this *hand-writing comparison* is the cornerstone of SICKEL's new method. BRESSLAU, in his *URKUNDENLEHRE* ['*DIPLOMATICS*'], has presented the core of SICKEL's reasoning with the following words: "If several documents of the same originator for different recipients, who cannot be proven to be connected, so, for example for an Italian bishopric and a German monastery, or for a Bavarian church and a layman from Niedersachsen, have been completely

or partly written by the same hand, this hand-writing equality can thus be explained by their production in the chancery of the originator, because the assumption they could originate with the same forger, after everything we know about generating medieval forgeries, is completely ruled out." (We follow this with the added comment that not only the hand-writing comparison, but the comparison of the inner attributes: language, word peculiarities, model-like idioms, composition of the text, which is what the expert calls the "Dictate" of the document, are consistent staples of modern diplomatics.)

In the possession of this new SICKELIAN method, the researchers since lull themselves in a sense of security, and sport the conviction that their science has now finally been erected on solid foundations. Unfortunately, they are in error. For BRESSLAU'S above statement, proclaimed with the certainty of a mathematical axiom, which gives guidelines on how to absolutely rule out the assumption of a forgery, stands on wobbly feet. I will deliver proof that a forgery of several hand-writing equivalent documents of the same originator for different independent recipients is not at all "completely ruled out", but rather, under a certain condition, very well and very easily possible. And with the moment in which this proof becomes evident, the diplomatical science, naturally, again loses its support and collapses.

One will not expect me to put this proof down here in a few words now. I can gather this proof only in slow, thorough work, piece by piece, until it eventually receives its complete rounding-off. All my following elaborations are stages to that proof. We now take the first step forward. Diplomats is able to report of several peculiar cases, in which the forgeries turned out to be the *action of a multitude of individuals* and of associations respectively. This fact of associate forgery, we now want to briefly discuss by an example of action connected with the BENEDICTINE monastery REICHENAU. We thank K BRANDI²⁶ for the first comprehensive revelations on this peculiar REICHENAU forgery action.

"Overall, in REICHENAU, forgeries of Imperial diplomas on a larger scale have been carried out three times." And now we hear BRANDI's explanation of the associate action: "Peculiarly related forgeries (outside REICHENAU) are also found in the monasteries OTTOBEUREN, KEMPTEN, BUCHAU, LINDAU, RHEINAU and STEIN ON THE RHEIN." In particular, a forged so-called monastery steward diploma which, trimmed according to location, was produced in all of the named abbeys. "So intense is the connection by text that exists between all those forgeries, that the circumstances of their production appear tightly interwoven." BRANDI shows that the hearth of this forgery action must have stood in the REICHENAU monastery, and comments further in detail: "The dependency (of the forgeries in REICHENAU and KEMPTEN) even extends across the entire production process and graphical outfit. [...] So, with this REICHENAU steward diploma, quite a similar distribution is noticeable as that which SCHEFFER-BOICHORST²⁷ once traced within the ZISTERZIENSIAN congregation." So, BRANDI registers a *joint action within a diocese*, SCHEFFER-BOICHORST one *within related orders*. Another expert who concerned himself with the REICHENAU action, J LECHNER²⁸, arrives – naturally! we already want to say – at different results as BRANDI. As opposed to BRANDI, he doesn't consider the REICHENAU monastery inmate ODALRIC, but his predecessor the *associate* forger of two documents for REICHENAU, two for KEMPTEN, one for LINDAU and one for RHEINAU. LECHNER then still finds: not every monastery would have forged for itself individually (perhaps after a circulating model source), but the identity of the individual forger has been proven for several monasteries. The forging central office of all the above mentioned monasteries was in REICHENAU.

What was committed here in REICHENAU on a small scale was quite a systematic "improvement" of history. Since many of the forged documents are so-called palimpsests (i.e. pieces in which the forgery was placed on top of an erased text), a factual reality was thus first destroyed, and in its place, a phantasy world was carpentered. If one denotes the isolated,

singularly occurring forgery of *one* monastery as a *local* forgery undertaking, one can call undertakings such as the one in REICHENAU a *regional* one. On the path with the stops 1. Local forgeries and 2. Regional forgery action, we must now take a big step ahead. One is to imagine the circumference of an associate action (such as the one in REICHENAU) extended by a multiple! So, one is to imagine a forgery undertaking which, with regards to scope and consequences, relates to a regional action, as the regional one relates to a local one. Quite clearly stated: one is to imagine a *forgery action on the biggest scale*, a *universal* action. With this, I ask the reader not to be unnecessarily intimidated at this early point by a thought which still appears to be unbelievable and monstrous; during the course of the evidence being presented, they will very quickly gain confidence in this thought. At this point, we are only talking about assumptions, and guesses, and the following statements are only meant to get a little closer to the big problem of a universal forgery action, to place it before us, to begin with, even steer our consciousness to its actual existence.

If we face the question: in the Middle Ages, was a historical forgery action on the largest scale, a universal forgery action, even conceivable and possible? Such an enormous action was possible under one condition: namely, that there existed a widespread association of people, tightly connected in terms of organisation, who – one and all – fostered an equally strong interest in a big, planful falsification of history. Any old individual person, also a small or even a bigger group of only randomly and loosely connected people cannot seriously consider a universal action which aims at a general and planful falsification of the entire history of the Middle Ages (of which, in this book, we are only interested in German history). *If however, the plan to such undertaking is born in the central brains of a tightly organised society of global importance, then its implementation is very well possible.* A further necessary prerequisite in this is, that such medieval association of interest, besides a sufficient number of members, would be in possession of the necessary scientific and

material means: education and monetary means. Now, such powerful, worldwide organisation did indeed exist, and the reader, aided by the course of the investigation, will be put in a position to identify this organisation, at first vaguely and guessing, later clearer and more defined. This organisation would be all the more able to put such a plan into practice, if it had the great fortune to possess the *science as a monopoly*; thus, outsiders would not even be in a position to realise that, in the heart of this organisation, anything secret was going on, let alone to control or prevent these things.

Just in passing, we want to brush off an objection which may raise its voice here: It would sure be impossible to actually put into action so monstrous a task, reaching into the smallest details, such as the systematic falsification of medieval German history. However, it is not at all impossible and not all as difficult as it may seem at first glance. In our forgery association, there were helpers and learned heads in sufficient numbers, and also, they were able to take their time. Before we start, it may help to point out that the big universal forgery action was not the work of a year, or even a decade, but rather, it was an undertaking which span *across a period of about a century*, representing the work of several generations. Now, that even a single, industrious man was able to fabricate volumes of forgeries, conjuring entire fairytale lands before the eyes, is proven by Mr GEORGE "PSALMANAZAR", one of the most talented fraudsters of the 18th century. In 1704, a book on FORMOSA was published by him which gives an in-depth description of FORMOSA: not only of its history, but also of the natural composition of the island, furthermore a description of politics and constitution of the FORMOSANS, their morals and habits etc. We also find out in-depth about the previously unknown language of FORMOSA. And what did it turn out to be? PSALMANAZAR's work is prose, is the product of his flourishing imagination! The story of the famous land Formosa is, like everything else, plucked from thin air, even the language is made up.

As a second example, for our subject of far greater significance, we present the "FABELFÜRSTENREIHE" [= lit. "Series of Fabulous Princes"] of the Austrian Chronicles²⁹. These Chronicles which were created in the year 1394 in VIENNA, contains a curious piece, a chain of invented Austrian rulers. The reader is to imagine this: beginning with the year 859 after the [biblical] flood (!), the Viennese fairytale poet has, across the enormous period of 2975 years, a total of 81 made-up "rulers" reign over the country Austria! Certainly no small effort for the imagination of the forger. "A fixed procedure is being employed in the description of the government of such a (invented) ruler. First, name and title of the ruler and the country's coat of arms are mentioned, or the latter, if it is new, is described. After this, we find out about ancestry and name of the princess (naturally, also invented), and the inherited coat of arms of her father. Then, the time of government of the ruler and the time of his wife's death, how many years before or after the death of the husband, are stated. Finally, we learn of the place of burial and the descendants of the ruling pair." Our fairytale-ist plasters the country fourteen times with made-up names, and he named his fairytale Austria, in the beginning, JUDEISAPTA (!), then ARRATIM, further SAURICZ, SANNAS, PANNAUZ, TANTAMO, MITTANAWZ etc. The last name before the German names OSTERLAND and ÖSTERREICH spells AVARA. The forger had the chronology of things in his fairytale land follow a plan: "With regards to the names of the country, we can determine an antique Pagan-Jewish epoch..., a Roman, a brief Avarian, and finally a German period." We can notice the same procedure with the invented peoples' names which, in the beginning, also have a Hebrew ring to them. However, for their long period, the forger (or forgers) needed over 200 names which had to be invented! "And so, he helped himself with mechanical letter re-arranging ... There are literally swap series. One is to compare, say, these groups: SAPTAN, LAPTAN, REPTAN, LIPTAN, RIPPAN; FULTAN (SULTAN), PILTAN; RATTAN, RANTAN, RETTAN; TATAN, TANTAN, TANTON..." In order to decorate this lean sketch of the 81 rulers more lively, make it appear

more historically authentic, the forger has the country be left/inherited according to changing laws, and has his fairytale country partitioned multiple times. But the busy story-teller produces several blunders. "That one can leave a passed-away son for a descendant, and still produce a daughter, especially when the mother dies half a year before the father, as it happened during the 42nd rule, is a physiological outrage. Earlier still, PILTAN, the son of SALANT and RACHAIM, has died before father and mother and lay buried with them"³⁰, all the while SALANT finds his resting place "up from NUSSDORF", and RACHAIM "this side of WERDERTOR".

These here two examples have only been referenced in order to show: if even individual, stand-alone forgers can invent long "histories" of entire countries, a plotted falsification of the German history of the Middle Ages through a best-organised and widespread association, furnished with all necessary auxiliaries, should sure not be all that difficult. If such association were to commit to such plan, it would certainly also be in a position to implement it.

One could object now: diplomatics may have discovered countless cases of local forgery, and has also discovered several regional enterprises, yet it was never able to notice anything in the way of a universal forgery action. Quite right. The stress here is on: *was not able*. With their methods which are geared towards the "local" scale, and which are already, in "regional" cases on a larger scale, such as the one mentioned REICHENAU case, tricky to handle, the diplomatists could not possibly detect the actuality of any universal enterprise. Yet in their daily work, they bump into many traces of this universal action; they lay there so numerous and so obvious, that one has to wonder how it could be possible not to see the wood for the trees.

5.

The medieval forgeries do not stem from 'practical' forgers

In then previous chapter, we have referenced a statement by BRESSLAU, in which he elaborates in meaningful style on the foundation of nowadays diplomatics – the hand-writing comparison introduced by SICKEL.³¹ That statement originates from the 1st edition of his "*DIPLOMATICAL SCIENCE*". When the 2nd edition of the book was published in 1912, the sentence had slightly changed its appearance, it carried limiting clauses, and the second half now reads: "... , since the assumption ... they could stem from the very same forger ... can generally be, besides the few exceptional cases which have to be explained separately, considered impossible." So, BRESSLAU now concedes that the SICKELIAN foundation rule which says: equal hand-writing for several documents of the same originator for varying, independent recipients proves the genuine production in the chancery, can suffer exceptions, and yes, has already suffered them. BRESSLAU himself mentions three prominent exceptions (among them, already known to us, the REICHENAU action) which demonstrate that several pieces equal in hand-writing, by the same originator, and for varying, independent recipients originate from the same *forger*, and therefore, were not at all produced in the originator's chancery.

With this, the SICKELIAN axiom has already received the first blow. The not only potential, but already proven fact of an associate-regional forgery action is the first rock on which the noblest assumption of diplomatics, the hand-writing comparison, breaks apart. But the assumption is becoming completely and utterly worthless the moment we have to even only concede the *possibility* of a forgery enterprise on the largest scale, a universal enterprise. As is sure easy enough to understand, in the case of a universal enterprise, the fabrication of

equal hand-writing forgeries (in the forgery headquarters) for any number of independent recipients will be a cakewalk, yes, even the rule.

We now return to the main question from chapter 3: are the cases of medieval document forgery which researchers have so far discovered, really – as is accepted unhesitatingly to this day – to be considered *practical* forgeries? For example, are the already repeatedly mentioned REICHENAU events really in the 11th, 12th and 13th century occurring forgery cases committed by REICHENAU monastery inmates who, back then, wanted to surreptitiously obtain all sorts of advantages for their monastery and the other above mentioned monasteries? I say 'no' to this question, and will now set out to prove that these REICHENAU forgeries – as all the other many medieval document forgeries discovered by the diplomatists so far, by the way – represent no practical, but *learned* forgeries, more precisely, that they all are the discharge and result of the universal forgery action.

In order to characterise this universal enterprise a little more accurately, let it be mentioned here – for the time being, proofless – that it took place in the *closing stages of the Middle Ages*, and, in order to achieve its end, that it had to also forge the German *diplomatical* tradition of the entire Middle Ages.

And now on the the
evidence showing that the so far discovered medieval document forgeries could not be practical forgeries.

1. The REICHENAU forgeries.

I proceed with the evidence by letting the reader view the *modus operandi* of the REICHENAU forgers under the magnifying glass. How will a human being proceed when they want to fabricate a forged document? Their work is uniquely prescribed for them by the nature of the

forgery: they cannot just willy-nilly forge away all day, but they have to stick to originals. Is a forged document to fulfil its *practical* end – i.e. is it to deceive with the intended success – it will have to resemble the genuine document as much as even possible. In order to create this veil of authenticity, every forger will strive to re-create his falsification, so it will resemble as closely as possible the original source in its inner and outer attributes. This so goes without saying that there should actually be no need for any discussion. Inevitably however, the reader will have to be, in the science of diplomatics, pointed to something that goes without saying again and again, which is none of my fault. Now, there are skilled and unskilled forgers; but if an unskilled forger meets his goal only halfway, it is because of his limited skills, and not for a lack of goodwill. One more thing that goes without saying: it lies in the nature of the subject that it is completely impossible that a forger could perhaps, entirely on purpose, blatantly ignore his authentic copy in the most important features, and fancy himself in the fabrication of pure imagination. At any rate, no "practical" forger will be found guilty of any such thing. More than anything, document forgers have always had to steer their attention to the exact re-tracing of the *hand-writing* of the authentic copy. Just a brief explanation on medieval hand-writing. Palaeography (=Science of old hand-writings) is the science of the old (Latin) hand-writing and its development. If one takes a look at the (Latin) oldest hand-writings from MEROWINGIAN, CAROLINGIAN and the later Emperors' times, there appears to be, at first glance, a continuous change in the shape of the letters. In the diplomas of the varying medieval centuries, one can spot letters of the most peculiar shape; on closer inspection however, one recognises good old acquaintances: namely, the always same known Latin letters which only face us in changing masquerade. What is called the development (of the letters), presents itself merely by the letters of the individual century

1. Being decorated with different flourishes,
2. That they are of different size and length,
3. That in one era, they appear more square, in another more rounded off.

Now, we finally approach the REICHENAU forgeries and their allegedly "practical" creators. In doing so, I will adhere to the findings published by K BRANDI³² and J LECHNER³³ on this subject. The numerous Reichenau forgeries, according to the named researchers, are supposed to be separated into four groups; namely, forgeries 1. From the 10th century, 2. From the end of the 11th century, 3. From the beginning of the 12th and 4. From the second half of the 12th century.

Belonging to the group allegedly of the 10th century are two false diplomas in the name of CHARLES III. and one of OTTO I. As the forger of these pieces, one scribe POPPO C, who, in 940, left the Imperial chancery, has been determined, who therefore after his leave "continued" his former profession "in unlawful fashion, and thus covered the diplomatical requirements of REICHENAU (and RHEINAU)". Now, just how has POPPO C completed his task? In order to fabricate the diplomas of CHARLES III., the very first thing he did, what every other forger must and will do, was to pick from the archive of the monastery "genuine" pieces which were meant to serve as his model sources. He found originals of CHARLES III. and has indeed utilised those for his forgeries. (LECHNER, l.c., p 31f.). For the content of his forgery, the diploma M. 1541, for the hand-writing M. 1637 [diplomatist/historical document 'tags'], both Charles III., were the main sources. Since M. 1637 still exists, we are in the position, with regards to the re-tracing of the hand-writing, to compare POPPO's forgeries with the original – and what is the verdict? Let us hear LECHNER on this point: "To begin with, the overall impression shows no leaning at all to match the chancery's hand-writing under CHARLES III. The occasional use of a closed 'a' next to the open 'a' in the running text certainly points to a later time. Details, such as the occasionally perceptible over-flourishing of the upper stems of the 's', 'f', 'c', or the shape of the 'g' as well as the abbreviation sign, rather remind of the hand-writing in OTTO I.'s diplomas. *These are elements* which, in thoughtless moments, have snuck into the scribe's (forger's) pen."

Indeed, a peculiar diagnosis! And the amazement is increasing the more one seeks to get involved with the psychology of the forger. It is not that Poppo C might have ventured to, somehow and whichever way possible, mask his natural hand-writing, but he wanted to copy a hand-writing source, namely the original diploma (M. 1637) of CHARLES III. One will shout: so, our scribe is simply a fairly *unskilled* forger, if already the overall impression of his re-traced hand-writing betrays the forgery. However, this is in no way the case. LECHNER himself highlights that POPPO copied his model source with "remarkable care", and indeed, a glance at fig. 1, with photographic reproductions of the originals (M. 1637) and the two forgeries (M. 1699 and M. 1700), which were an addendum to LECHNER's essay, reveals that the forger has re-traced certain parts and details (e.g. chrisms, prolonged [lengthened] writing, initial impulse on certain upper 'lengths', the 'A' and 'st' ligatures, date line) with remarkable skill. Therefore, our Poppo was perhaps skilled, but he was also an unskilled forger! Should this not give us a start? Is this not a contradiction? We will further hear LECHNER, by what the skilled forger's lack of skill reveals itself. It turns out that at times, Poppo has completely forgotten that he'd set out to re-trace a model source, because he is overcome by "thoughtless moments" during which he, in full mental absence, blatantly ignores his source, and, automatically, letter shapes of *his* time flow out of his pen. So, POPPO has to be terribly scatter-brained; because: that he completely forgets his source and puts letter shapes of his time on paper, happens to him not once, but very often – so often that even the overall impression betrays the forgery. An interesting psychological case: the forger who, on the one hand, is very observant during re-tracing (skilled reproduction of certain parts of his model source), at the same time, on the other hand, proves to be extremely scatter-brained and unobserving. Not perhaps in the sense that his initial attention to detail withers by and by during work, but, according to the findings of the forgeries, it has been decided that the forger must have been *simultaneously*, that is, spread across the entire work, observant and

unobservant, so that focussed attention and utter distraction must have been, in a way, relieving each other in his consciousness in the fashion of alternating current!

Such a state of mind is psychologically impossible. Why, indeed, proof is very easily obtained that the forger has constantly completed his work under strong pressure on his attentiveness, that there could not be any talk of scatter-brainedness or "thoughtless moments". Lechner says that, in thoughtless moments, the shape of the letter 'g', for example, would creep into the scribe's pen which can only mean that the forger, oftentimes, would not pay enough attention to his source, and put down the shape (of the letter 'g'), familiar to him from his times, by accident. However, if we now throw a glance at the facsimiles of the two forgeries and their model sources, we make an amazing observation: namely, we see that the characteristic 'g' of the model source has not been re-traced even one single time by the scribe, that, whenever there is a 'g' appearing in the forgery, not even the slightest attempt was made to re-trace the 'g' of the model source in any aspect. Instead, the scribe writes (in the text) *consistently and without exception* the 'g' of his time with the quite distinct 'stem-loop' [forgive me, dear reader, may you know exactly what that means, because I have only a vague idea] which, with downright stunning regularity, bends to the right at the end. This is exactly the same as with the other letter shapes (e.g. 'p', 'r', abbreviation sign). Here, too, the scribe deems it quite unnecessary to trouble himself with the re-tracing of the relevant hand-writing attributes of his source, he makes the letters the way he pleases, *but then, consistently adheres to their shapes!* In order to tenaciously, from beginning to end, ignore quite certain elements of the source, and, in other places, add different shapes as consistently, an uninterrupted, equally strong focus on one's attention is required for the entire duration of the work. Such consistent denial of *quite certain elements* in the source cannot be founded upon neglect, scatter-brainedness, lack of attention, but there is *consciousness and purpose at work!* A forger copying his hand-writing model source sure can, here and there, in

thoughtless moments, re-paint his model source in unskilled manner, even very unskilled, he can, occasionally, have any old letter in its natural, unveiled style creep in, but it is psychologically quite impossible that a human being, with consciousness, purpose and consequence, in a manner of speaking, can be unobservant and scatter-brained. A person who, on the one hand, copies his source truly and carefully, but who, on the other hand, *consistently* ignores quite *certain elements* of the same source, acts in full deliberation!

The Reichenau forger POPPO C, in important points, consciously and deliberately deviates from his source. In doing so, he clearly states a disregard for the authentic copy, which would be flat out impossible with a *practical* forger who, regardless of the extent of his lack of skill, will nonetheless, still and always, have the goodwill and intention to copy his source as well as possible. A *practical* document forger who proceeded thus, who so brazenly breaks the highest rule of his profession, in a matter which is not supposed to be child's play, either, is a quite impossible occurrence, from which follows with necessity: *The discussed REICHENAU falsifications can in no case be practical forgeries.*

We now turn to the REICHENAU forger group of the alleged 11th century. Particularly relevant are a forged document of CHARLES III. (BRANDI No. 27), and a forgery in the name of ARNOF (BRANDI No. 37). According to BRANDI³⁴, these two falsifications do *not* stem from the same hand. It is very conspicuous now that both of these forgers suffer the same misfortune as their colleague POPPO C in the 10th century. Perfectly akin with the latter, they, too, besides great skill in re-tracing of an authentic copy, demonstrate a crass lack of skill, so that their creations betray the forgery at first sight. "This is quite distinct with No. 27. The comparison of the hand-writing of our forgery with that of the Imperial diploma VII, 18 on fig. 4 indicates how the REICHENAU forger was striving to possibly re-create an original. With the chrism, the scribe has not quite understood the context of the lines anymore, he draws incorrect connections; again and again, he starts anew, yet never achieves accuracy; exactly

as with the chrism, the abbreviation sign is misunderstood. While in general, he achieves the character of the simple letters, he, then again, betrays himself when copying the upper stems of the 'f', 's', 'st'. For the scribe of the original sported the peculiarity to fork those letters in the middle, i.e. in drawing the line upwards to already fork off before the line; the forger did not comprehend this style, and believed to achieve the same by inserting the upper stem-leg with its mannerised flourishes into the base stem *randomly*. In the overall impression, the aspired hand-writing is indeed achieved via the observed meticulousness." (BRANDI, p 51)

The whole thing sounds pretty harmless. A forger misunderstands graphical elements of his original, and helps himself as best he can – an everyday event, one wants to say. A probing glance at the photographic reproduction of the forgery however, reveals a different set of circumstances. (BRANDI, fig. 4) The same forger who, in copying the so-called prolonged writing, betrays that he is very well capable of re-tracing the even more difficult letters with remarkable accuracy, *has not at all made the attempt to follow the original with the chrism, the abbreviation sign, the forked upper legs of of the 'f', 's', 'st'*. He has instead slapped on paper random flourishes, but *again, those quite consistently across the forgery*. In these places, he has not "misunderstood the context of the lines", because every child who has somewhat learned how to handle a pen, can do better, and that without any major effort; much rather, he has not at all attempted to achieve any likeness – with his talent for copying, it would have been an easy thing for him to do so – he has consistently and in full deliberation disregarded certain elements of his model source in order to put down different shapes instead. He shares this superior treatment of the authentic copy with POPPO C, and, much like POPPO C, the REICHENAU scribe from the 11th century could not possibly have been a forger who followed *practical* motives with his creations.

Next, a spiritual twin of POPPO C and the 11th century forger stands before us in the form of this busy counterfeiter of document who has to be addressed as the originator of the

well-known REICHENAU Forgery action for the alleged 12th century. Again, it is the graphical impression of the falsifications that interests us, namely, we want to preferably steer our attention to the two REICHENAU forgeries M. 1567 and 1766, the one M. 961 from Lindau, and the KEMPTENER forgeries M. 157 and M. 158. This forger, allegedly of the 12th century, too, has slapped his creations together so wretchedly with regards to the hand-writing side of things that his natural hand-writing not only shimmers through everywhere, but it downright forces itself. Yes, our forger goes about it wilder than his predecessors, and he has in some cases seen it his duty to principally and per se disregard an authentic copy, and to deliver products of pure phantasy instead. The forger wants to forge two diplomas in the name of CHARLES THE GREAT, for example, for KEMPTEN. And how does he set to work? He takes an 'authentic' diploma of CHARLES III. (!) which he erases except the original recognition sign, then adheres to all possible, or rather impossible, hand-writing model sources, only not to an authentic diploma of CHARLES THE GREAT, and boldly mixes letter shapes of all the different centuries, all over the place. He thus falls for the peculiar idea to insert, in the documents of CHARLES THE GREAT, "flourishing of the 't' stem in the lengthened writing which was commonplace only since around the end of the 10th century, or the zig-zag flourishes of the upper stems which in this shape owe to the diplomatic miniscule of around 1050-1150."³⁵ Not only that, he also decorates his fabrications with graphic peculiarities of the Papal documents of that time. (LECHNER, p 42, 43)

In both forgeries for the own monastery REICHENAU, the forger betrays himself by said characteristic style of individual letters. In the one document (M. 1567), he presents himself "still very helpless in the re-tracing of diplomatical hand-writing", while in M. 1766, he has grown a little "more skilled"; shapes which he accomplished only rarely in 1567, he has now "acquired". (LECHNER, p 70, 71) However, the forgery for Lindau proves to us that our forger was not all that badly suited [with regards to talent] for the task. Lechner mentions

this with praise (p 72): "The LINDAU spurium (=forgery) is testament to a virtuosity which is rarely met in medieval forgers, if they want to pass their fabrications off as belonging to times so far removed as ours." Yet – "Yet, in this, he still did not succeed (not in the Lindau forgery, either) in blotting out the individual character of his own hand-writing." (p 61)

One has to admit that our forger is a peculiar fellow. On the one hand, exceptionally skilled in re-tracing strangers' type face, he, on the other, conducts his work so bumssciously that one recognises his natural hand-writing (of the 12th century) everywhere and obviously. How is one to explain such contradiction? Quite simply, says LECHNER, the tell-tale sign of later works have "involuntarily crept in" (p 41). At first sight, nothing appears more plausible than this explanation, but in order to convince oneself of the nullity of this explanation attempt, a little mulling over and the comparison of the facsimiles of the forgeries (fig. II) will suffice. As a *practical* forger, it could not have occurred to the REICHENAU monastery inmate to forge phantasy products, but rather, he had to copy "authentic" sources. In the Lindau spurium, we see that, for the accomplishment of such work, he brought extraordinary talent to the table. Now, if however, he was supposed to, simultaneously, be unskilled, untalented, inattentive in his work, his lack of skill, his lack of practice, his carelessness in the re-tracing of his hand-writing model sources had to express itself in quite a characteristic fashion: especially in the inaccuracy, the imperfection of the re-traced letter shapes. If a forger can only "clumsily" copy a certain 'r' of some period, it will nonetheless have to always be the same letter, the same flourish etc. which appears clumsy and inaccurate in the forgery. The forger cannot possibly, from all the lack of practice, carelessness, or whatever else one may want to call his state of mind, *re-trace something* that is not contained in the original! At any, rate, he cannot do this consistently across the entire forgery. If the CAROLINGIAN originals did *not* contain a flourish of the 't' stem in the way they appear in the falsifications, how then could the forger re-trace them "clumsily", accidentally? How can

something "randomly creep up on" a "clumsy" forger that could not have been contained in his originals? If a forger wants to copy an original from his era, i.e. written in a hand-writing of his time familiar to him (i.e. our forger, an original from the 12th century), it can certainly happen to him that, despite the re-tracing, elements of *his* natural hand-writing shine through, if he has no talent for re-tracing of hand-writings. However, with our Reichenau forger, the case is this: the writing of the KAROLINGIAN period which was to be copied, was in almost all aspects fundamentally different from *his* natural hand-writing, and therefore, he had to copy graphical elements which, in a psychological sense, bore no relation to the hand-writing style natural and familiar to him. The forger must have worked in a downright murky state of mind if, in copying such strange letter shapes, something which was not contained in his original, such as the hallmarks of a later time, were supposed to have "unwittingly crept up" on him. *In any case, after the first or second "involuntary accident", he would have had to notice and correct such an enormous, blatantly obvious deviation from the original.* However, he has not noticed his monstrous blunders, but spryly copied away which means he *deliberately* deviated from his original. The facsimiles deliver full proof of that.

Although the photographic representations of the six forgeries in fig. II show, by certain graphical peculiarities, that all falsifications originate from one and the same forger's hands, they, at the same time, also clearly show *that each of the six documents individually represents a stand-alone unit, internally complete.* As arbitrarily as the forger seems to have worked on the whole, he has behaved equally consistently in the realm of each individual document. If one were to compare, for example, the 'f' in the six documents (in 'felicita'), it turns out that 1567 and 961 have the simple 'f', but in deviating form, that furthermore, 158, 157 and 1361, instead of the simple 'f', show the MEROWINGIAN 'f'-connection, but also not in the same version, because the 'fi' distinguishes itself from the 'fi' of the other forgeries in the

most conspicuous fashion. Equally, in almost all documents, the shapes of the 'g', 'st', are distinguished by slight modifications.

If one now examines the letter shapes, separately for the stock of each individual document, namely with regards to the strange, later elements which were supposed to have accidentally snuck into the scribe's pen, it is easy to determine that the *most strict consistency* ruled in employing such shapes. And strangely, in all diplomas, *immediately, the first time* when a certain letter appears, it happens to the scribe that he goes off track over a mannerised flourish, and, in the relevant document, this going off track happens to him every time that this same letter appears again. The flourishing of the upper stems of certain letters (e.g. 's') is very educational in this respect. One is to compare the flourishes in M. 158 and M. 1361: the flourishes of both these diplomas are (especially in the text) different alright, but within the same document, they remain the same. Not and never is this the working procedure of a man who, in copying a model source, *temporarily* lacks the required attention, i.e. who occasionally commits an inaccuracy *by accident*. The entire nature and air of this forgery activity much rather finds its explanation in the deviations from the original having been undertaken *with full deliberation*. And that means: the scribe of these falsifications could not have been a practical forger.

In discussing the fourth REICHENAU forgery group, allegedly from the second half of the 12th century, we can keep it brief, because – naturally! one already wants to shout out before – this forger, too, the trustee and scholar ODALRIC, has so carelessly slapped together "his quite clumsy forgeries" that anybody can spot at first sight: these creations, a practical document forger has *not* written. With regards to superior contempt for "authentic" documents, ODALRIC tops all his predecessors, why, one has to assume that, for some forgeries, he never refereed to any model source, e.g. he decorates the forgery in the name of KARL MARTELL (BRANDI No. 2) with a "*freely invented, quite monstrous recognition sign*".

(BRANDI, same place, p 58) Despite the fact that he must have had access to an *authentic document* of the major domus [custodian, house-keeper] (BRANDI, p 40), he also commits a massive blunder with regards to the content: he makes KARL MARTELL the Emperor (!), and thus writes: 'signum Karoli serenissimi imperatoris'. Directly after however, the "simpleton forger" notices that there is something that couldn't be quite right about this signature line, because now, he has KARL sign once more, this second time, correctly as 'Karlo major dominatu'. How deeply must our "practical" forger have been caught in his murky state of mind, that he *could write down two each other contradicting signatures* without ever noticing his mistake, and how mighty must his psychic gift have been, that he found something in his original which was not written in it. Much like in a second forgery, also in the name of KARL MARTELL (BRANDI No. 1), the forger ODALRICH has – naturally – here, too, with No. 2, copied his model source which he had access to (BRANDI, p 55) with such remarkable lack of skill that a *mixed hand-writing, composed of the most varying elements* emerged, in which also – naturally! – *his* natural writing style has "crept in" continually. And still, we have not quite met our ODALRICH in all his forging splendour. Namely, ODALRICH has written his forgery of *KARL MARTELL* (No. 1) on a largely erased diploma of – ARNOLF (!) – on which only ARNOLF's seal and the original recognition sign were left. His forgery in the name of CHARLES THE GREAT (BRANDI No. 8), he fabricates in the following ingenious manner: a document of LUDWIG THE GERMAN is being erased, except those places where the recognition sign and LUDWIG's seal are placed. On this scraped-off parchment, which therefore still carries the original recognition sign and LUDWIG's seal, the forger writes his document of CHARLES THE GREAT. Now, in order to mix things up a little in the external attributes of his piece of art, the clever ODALRICH, in his CHARLES THE GREAT document with the LUDWIG seal, draws a chrism and monogram of a document of CHARLES III. (!) Indeed, the ways of the medieval 'practical' forgers are wonderful; they leave no stone

untuned to embarrass themselves, and to, right from the beginning, jeopardise the very success of their work. Why, if they bother at all to look at a model source, they seem to see their task not in copying the attributes of the original with the greatest possible resemblance, but in modifying them any which way. May he/she who is receptive for a little humour, paint himself the picture of abbot FRIEDELLOH, watching our busy trustee Odalrich in his brilliant handiwork, patting him on the shoulder and exclaiming in admiration: "Bravo, dear brother ODALRICH! Quite splendid the way you made that thing there! The resemblance! How genuine! You are a artist in a thousand ways, brother ODALRICH!" –

To briefly mention it one more time: the conscious disregard of the "authentic" copies, so starkly emerging in all Reichenau forgeries, is proof that there was no practical reason at work, but that – as will be explained at length later – those forged creations are a product of the late medieval, learned, universal history forgery action. The *entirely uniform style* of all of these falsifications from all those alleged different centuries clearly proves, that these blunderful pieces stem from one forgery headquarters; in fabricating their forgeries, practical forgers do not set to work so nonsensically. How peculiar: every time, when there was forging going on in Reichenau in the alleged 10th, 11th or 12th century, the forgers sank into a deeply foggy state of mind. Could this possibly be caused by the Reichenau air?

6.

The peculiar mental state of medieval forgers

The following briefly discussed cases now offer *further evidence*, that discovered medieval document forgeries could not possibly have been "practical" forgeries. In this, we will make the amazing discovery that, in different places in the Middle Ages, too, the forgers fell into the same peculiar mental state when producing their creations as their REICHENAU colleagues.

1. Forgeries for HELMARSHAUSEN.³⁶

The forger entering the scenery here has set himself the task to craft a false document in the name of Pope EUGENS III. To that end, he had a genuine document of EUGENS III. in front of him, which he could have followed, and, as a practical forger, would have followed, naturally. But what do we hear now? "Initially, one should expect that the forger [...], for the crafting of his creation, would have used not only the wording of EUGENS' III. privilege, in whose possession the HELMARSHAUSEN archive had been, but also would have tried to design the external impression after its original, in order to achieve the purpose of the forgery by reaching the deceptive effect of a genuine document with a piece resembling as much as possible a genuine privilege of EUGENS III." Quite right, as a "practical" forger, he would have had to try this! "But already one look at this peculiar creation teaches us that that was the very thing the forger deliberately (!) avoided. Neither in the graphical composition [...] nor in the hand-writing (!) is even the slightest resemblance (!) [...] detectable. [...] Just what particular purpose he had in mind with the false document of EUGENS III., is not quite apparent in this ..."

2. The forged Papal documents of the Lateran.³⁷

We will now discuss forgeries which occurred in medieval Rome. The reason why, of all things, forgery cases from Rome are consulted, we will find out at a later point.

At first, we hear of a forgery in the name of PASCHAL II. P KEHR, to whom we owe the examination of these forgeries, makes an interesting side comment: "That SICKEL and OTTENTHAL could have considered this creation an original of PASCHAL II., proves how limited the knowledge of the nature of Papal documents was only 20 years ago (KEHR writes in 1911), even with our foremost diplomatists." Now, the forger of this document proceeded peculiarly clumsy, so clumsy and crazy that he picks as a model source for his forgery not perhaps an original of PASCHAL II., but an original of of Pope CALIXT II. Therefore, in his creation, in the so-called rota, stupid also places below the PASCHAL forgery CALIXT's Papal motto! He then places a row of cardinals' signatures below the forgery, and here (going by KEHR, p 9), the determination that "they are in part completely invented", shall suffice. Kehr reckons that because of the relatively correct dating, the forger could have well had a genuine document of PASCHAL II. "It remains remarkable of course, that the forger did not follow this model source to a greater extent." Our forger crafted still other pieces, this time, one such in CALIXT II.'s name. Here now, we find out that he by no means was a dumbhead, but that this time, a forgery turned out which was even quite excellently crafted. Because, this time, he has re-produced his model source quite accurately; he understood to re-draw the type font of his original so accurately "that one immediately recognises the scribe of the original source from it! In his meticulousness, he even re-created the changing of the ink just like in the original!" So, the man knew his trade! Once more, he sat down, and forged a document in the name of HADRIAN IV. According to KEHR, he made the formula-like composition of the forged document simply cleverly appearing genuine (p 15), but the date is not at all correct, and – now comes the surprise – "one look is enough to recognise the forgery right away,

because the hand-writing does not belong to the middle of the 12th century [[as should be the case with a genuine document of HADRIAN IV.]; insert by KAMMEIER], "but only to the early 13th century." In other words: our ingenious forger fails here so comprehensively, he is so all over the place with his thoughts that he totally forgets to re-trace the hand-writing of his model source – which he so simply cleverly managed in his earlier second CALIXT forgery – and that he, without looking at the original at all, simply and most carelessly writes the forgery *in the hand-writing of his time*. Which of course, everybody had to spot at first sight! Had the man gone insane? Here, the same state of mind the way we found it in the REICHENAUERS reveals itself. Our forger afforded himself an extra pleasure with this forgery by spryly drawing up Pope ANASTASIUS IV.'s instead of HADRIAN IV.'s motto.

3. Forged Papal documents in SWITZERLAND³⁸

The whole misery over the state of contemporary document critique reveals itself intensely in a strange principle of the expert scholars: if the tradition, i.e. here the diplomatical tradition – unearthes *several* times a per se impossible fact, e.g. the psychological monstrosity of medieval forgers (clever skilfulness at the same time as unprecedented clumsiness!) – then, the "impossibility" is considered "proven historically true and real". The experts shrug their shoulders and say: unfortunately, the semi-idiocy of medieval "practical" forgers can no longer be doubted. – Why? – What makes this fact irrefutable is simply the volume of cases! However, it is this very volume which proves something entirely different, at least to the educated amateur.

Kehr, *PAPAL DOCUMENTS OF SWITZERLAND* [*PAPSTURKUNDEN DER SCHWEIZ*; presumably the title of KEHR's publication], introduces us to a forger who, in his whole modus operandi, betrays himself as a right colleague of the REICHENAUERS. The task of the

Swiss forger consisted of manufacturing documents in the name of Pope CALIXT II., namely privileges for PETERLINGEN. He had at his disposal a "genuine" document of CALIXT II. for PETERLINGEN from the 3rd of April 1123 which he also followed for the wording. Thus far, everything would be just in perfect order. As however, the forger now set out to write down his opus, he fell, much like his REICHENAU colleagues, into a severely foggy mental state: namely, as model source for copying the *external* attributes (hand-writing), he didn't, as one would expect, use the same document of CALIXT II., but – a "genuine" document of *EUGEN III.* However, he hasn't been all that mentally absent, he still vaguely remembered that he had set out to fabricate a document in CALIXT's name, and so, he then really took *one* look at his CALIXT model source when he put the name of this pope to his creation. "But even in the external attributes, this document of CALIXT II. shines through only very remotely, namely in the signature of the Pope. Of course, the copy didn't come off well, and was probably not intended to, either (!). However, the expert can tell by some small details that the forger had on of those [CALIXT documents] before him." (KEHR) KEHR continues with a comment on the psychology of the medieval forgers which is most interesting, because it represents the general view of diplomatical researchers on forgers' psychology: "The psychology of the forgers," says KEHR, "is not so simple. Oftentimes, they did especially the improbable in order to cover their tracks; however, their success has taught more than once that by the very thing by which they betray themselves to us, they succeeded with their compatriots at whom it was aimed. It is the production of a forgery aided by several model sources which we can so often observe in the workshop of the forgers." I guess I can dispense with a long comment on this peculiar psychological statement. Based upon the referral to general experience, we can declare with absolute certainty: it can be ruled out that medieval practical document forgers who are in possession of their regular mental powers could have resorted to that sort of manipulation in order "to cover their tracks". If they had done "especially what we

perceive improbable", namely to incorporate in their fabrication, which has been signed in a certain name, a muddle of the worst order with regards to both internal and external attributes, only the idiots among them could have told themselves that such *modus operandi* would be suited to cover their tracks – which, quite to the contrary, would be all the more betrayed by such extraordinarily stupid procedure. It remains as it was: as long as forgers have existed and will exist who pursue practical-materialistic goals with their forged pieces, they will strive, as lies in the nature of the subject, to copy any source by the relevant originator deemed authentic with the greatest possible resemblance – and of course, also several authentic sources, but from the same originator.

The subject: the forgers and their gullible, clueless contemporaries, will have to be discussed at a later time.

What is valuable in KEHR's argumentation is the concession, that he portrays the *modus operandi* of the PETERLINGER forger as conscious and deliberate, that he does not, as LECHNER assumes about the REICHENAU forgers, traces the blunders back to thoughtless moments.

However, the most ingenious trick our PETERLINGER forger plays in order to cover his tracks, I have not even mentioned at all yet. Let us hear what KEHR reports further on CALIXT II. fake document: "This combination is the most drastic with the Bleibulle (papal seal). The Avers (front side of the seal) is not a bad copy of a genuine bull of CALIXT II., but instead of taking the apostle stamp of Calixt II. belonging to the Revers (reverse side) with the apostle heads, he re-shapes one of EUGEN III." Now, if the contemporaries were unable to see that they were facing a doubtlessly genuine document of CALIXT II., where the smart forger had put in such extraordinary effort to give his work of art the appearance of the "most authentic authenticity" – why, in that case, they can't be helped. Our supersmart forger also crafted a

second forgery, also in the name of CALIXT II. In doing so, he followed the exact same procedure as with his first work of art, that is, he again took the external attributes of the EUGEN document, and also decorated the second piece with that fabulous mixed bull. Then, he thought he ought to do something extra in order to cover his tracks: "In the dating, he forgot the word 'subdiaconi', and the, in forgery no. 1, correctly copied Aerenjahr¹ 1123 (which he had taken from the "authentic" CALIXT document), he arbitrarily alters to 1121, thus putting himself in contradiction with the remaining time attributes" (Kehr). Result: the *conscious* deviation from the natural choice CALIXT's document would have been, proves that the PETERLINGEN privileges could not have been practical-materialistic forgeries.

4. The fake CAROLINGIAN documents for ST. MAXIMIN (TRIER)³⁹

The four remaining forgeries for ST. MAXIMIN, still available in the original writing, in the names of PIPPIN, CHARLES THE GREAT, LUDWIG THE PIOUS and LOTHAR II., have been written by *one* [and the same] hand, and stem from a man whose mental state lively reminds us of the REICHENAU forgers. Because the Maximinian, too, in crafting his fakes, falls into a psychologically murky state, which reveals itself by the fact that he, while striving to [accurately] copy "genuine" sources, subconsciously but consistently weaves in attributes peculiar to his time (i.e. the 11th century) and to *his natural hand-writing*. Let us hear what DOPSCH reports on this. "In general, one will be permitted to say that these forgeries, with regards to their external appearance, have turned out very klutzy, thus, that at first sight (!), *the entire difference of the hand-writing characteristics* distinguishes itself from that of the originals from CAROLINGIAN times with which we are faced. Right from the start, these original writings give the impression to be well more recent, nay, significantly more recent."

¹ 'Aerenjahr' relates to a certain timeline calculation. Stone me, I was unable to find any information whatsoever about this, even my 21-volume encyclopedia of everything lets me down. Jewgle translates: 'year of the year', and I – don't believe it.

DOPSCH also believes to have found the reason why the forger delivered such klutzy work; it could be viewed in the fact "that, at the time of the production of these forgeries, one was no longer versed in the old diploma hand-writing." Now, this explanation does not exactly hit the core of the problem. Namely, it cannot to be explained why the forger copied his model source clumsily, but what made him deviate from his model source in such distinct fashion. Regardless of how clumsy a copy is, it still is a copy, even a clumsy re-drawing of a graphical model source of the 9th century will, in general, show the contemporary hand-writing characteristics of the 9th century, albeit a little distorted and bulky. In no case can one refer to clumsiness as an explanation for the fact that there are quite distinct and essentially strange hand-writing attributes appearing, that is, consistently appearing, which were not in the model source that was to be copied. The distinct consistency also counters the assumption that such deviations would have "crept in accidentally", next to the lack of skill, the lack of attention can also be ruled out.

I am almost inclined to believe that the diplomatists who offer lack of skill or lack of attention for an explanation for the described deviations of the graphical attributes in the forgeries, have never understood in what way the elements of lack of skill and lack of attention are actually emerging in the re-drawings. If a forger copies his graphical model source deficiently and clumsily, be it from lack of talent or lack of practice or lack of attention, the general impression of the re-drawings will receive quite a characteristic coinage: clumsy, stiff, untidy, non-uniform, artificial – thus is the overall impression of these works. The individual letter appears, according to relevant better or worse turn-out of the re-drawing, *non-uniform*, while at the same time, resulting in varying manifestations, yet in doing so, nonetheless revealing an endeavour to illustrate the basic shape peculiar to it. Every letter appears throughout the lot in the most varying degrees of likeness; a bend to the left will always be a bend to the left, albeit the *modus operandi* may result in all sorts of

variation; to continually draw a bend to the right instead of a bend to the left will only be possible to a semi-idiot.

5. The forged HAMBURG documents of Kings and Popes

Among others, we owe PEITZ⁴⁰ for the examinations of this group of documents forged during the Middle Ages, allegedly for practical purposes. In more than one sense, his results are of invaluable significance to us. E.g., he is the only expert who could bring himself to the conclusion: the HAMBURG cases could not possibly have been practical-materialistic forgeries. So, PEITZ defends my thesis, although, as we will soon see, with different reasoning and different conclusions. Right away be it mentioned that the relevant HAMBURG documents are supposed to originate from the 9th to the 11th century, and that of 25 pieces, one critic (JAFFÉ) considers 14 forged, another (HACKE) 16, a third (CURSCHMANN) considers 12 forged. Naturally, these three diplomatists are of the opinion, which they take for granted, that the manufacture of the fake pieces took place in order to surreptitiously obtain certain advantages, "it goes without saying" that these would be practical forgeries. Now, how do these researchers support their assumption of the occurrence of the falsification? 1. The alleged papal documents from the 9th and 10th century are written on parchment; however, the papal chancery of that time produced their documents not on parchment, but on papyrus. 2. "The preserved Bleibullen do not correspond to the known genuine bulls of the popes." 3. In almost all Hamburg documents, changes, erasures have been made, actually, uncommonly frequently, a name has been erased, and then, another name has been placed over the erasure. There are also mistakes in the dating to be found. 4. Now comes a finding, which once more gives us testimony of the temporary insanity of alleged practical forgers in the Middle Ages: the HAMBURG forger in the 12th/13th century, too, wants to forge documents of the 9th/10th

century, and – happily writes his creations in the hand-writing of his time. Yet, the Hamburg forgers had authentic model sources before them!! (Peitz, p 189/190) They forged away without gracing the model sources with even a single glance at all. The educated amateur's brains have frozen, but this time, the ones of expert PEITZ also. So, he unmistakeably has his colleagues understand: "At once unbelievable foolishness ... and incomprehensible luck with these people" (he means the forgers). "They possess authentic copies ... What they allegedly needed and wanted would have been a marginal interpolation" (= the sneaking in of something). "Because the shred of special rights which they wanted to surreptitiously obtain for HAMBURG, would have been expressed with ease in a few inserted words or sentences in authentic documents. Instead, aided by scissors and glue pot, they craft a range of new documents, throw the old" (genuine) "overboard, and have more confidence in their creation than in all authentic bulls." ... "And at the same time, how counter-productive! The people were bargaining for all sorts of rights for their church and composed bulls, the later of which contained fewer [rights] than the earlier ones." ... "Here, one doesn't put it past the Hamburger that he buried even the most common sense before he'd set out to handiwork. In short, the thing is as foolishly conceived as is possibly imaginable. An elementary pupil who tries to escape a feared punishment via a forged signature, could barely go about it any more obviously or foolishly." (PEITZ, p 189/190) With these words, which leave nothing to wish in terms of clarity, PEITZ hits the nail on the head. When medieval men sit down to forge documents – be it in Reichenau or Hamburg or wherever else – they invariably, in a mysterious way, turn to elementary pupils, nay, to semi-idiot! And the expert scholars believe such thing willingly, they cannot but, why, the "fact" makes an appearance not once, but in heaps.

We must busy ourselves a little further with the HAMBURG forgeries, for the surprise is yet to come. Namely, what does Peitz conclude from the fact that the HAMBURG pieces

could not have possibly been forged for practical purposes? He declares: the pieces are "genuine"!! That is, they were no genuine, old originals from the papal chancery, but quite harmless new works after the genuine, old pieces. And why did the HAMBURGERS, according to PEITZ, do such a thing? "It is about the ambition to save what could be saved from the old archive stocks. The papyrus originals were heading unstoppably towards their destruction. One tried to replace them with copies, but was now depending on reinstating the fragments with own [auxiliary] means." Thus, the peculiar creations would be quite harmless copies of genuine pieces being in a "wretched condition." Strange, that the HAMBURGERS would so indifferently see such irreplaceable treasures, which otherwise were guarded like eyeballs [something very valuable] in the monasteries and churches because of their importance, fall to "destruction". Stranger still, that the HAMBURGERS now waited so long with the new issue, until on the old specimen especially the most important thing was no longer legible, namely the names, especially the names of the popes. Why, in at least six cases, the pope's name has been placed over an erasure! (PEITZ, p 185 f.) Going by PEITZ' thesis, that would be explained by the fact that the harmless new-issuer were no longer able to read the names in the original pieces. Peculiar coincidence, that the tooth of time was chewing up only the popes' names! The harmless collector, too, turned out to be, as PEITZ has to concede, a ninny; because he associated, e.g., "documents with completely impossible originators" (p 105). He erred considerably in the dating and proved to have a conspicuously "unlucky touch" in his performance by mixing up parts of different documents (p 29). In doing so, in his ninny-ness, he simultaneously developed a downright refined talent in the design^{II} of the document text! Why, PEITZ has made the discovery that his "harmless collector" had possessed quite an awesome knowledge of the habits of the papal chancery. That is demonstrated "with regards to the minutest detail of dictate, legal regulations, form habits" (p 5). No, the thesis of the

II The original has "Gestaltet". Seeing that there is no possible valid equal form of any of the words 'Gestalt', 'gestalten' in existence in the German language, my conclusion was: it should read 'Gestaltung' = 'design'.

harmless new-issuer is also indefensible. The confused work of the HAMBURGERS reminds with pin-point accuracy of the style of the REICHENAUERS and the other colleagues. The Hamburg pieces are forgeries – no practical ones however, PEITZ is completely right here – they are the heritage of the great forgery action from the end of the Middle Ages.

The incredibly important connection line that reaches from Hamburg into the papal chancery will still keep us busy later, more in-depth.

7.

"Stupidity as the most reliable of all explanations"

If I begin this chapter with the statement of a contemporary researcher who talks of "human stupidity" as "the most reliable of all explanations"⁴¹ in the realm of certain problems of historical science, the reader may thus look forward to some sublime source-critique pleasures which awaits them in this and the following chapters. While the previous passages proclaimed the strange insanity of medieval "practical" document forgers, we will now get to hear of the strange stupidity of medieval humans, as soon as they sat down to write "genuine" documents. It is stressed explicitly that the following passages are *not* dealing with documents that research considers forged, but documents chiefly regarded as "indubitably genuine".

During these investigations, our attention turns to the date entries, the **dating** of medieval documents. Before we begin, a brief explanation of the peculiarity of the dating in

the written pieces of the Middle Ages. One proceeded much more elaborate and thoroughly in the date entries than nowadays; they weren't set in the nowadays common, simple form (year, month, day), but in a fairly entangled attire below the documents. For our purposes however, it is sufficient to know that, next to the entry of the year (year of incarnation, Ärenjahr), of the months and days, the so-called 'date line' in medieval written pieces contains still further the following date attributes: the display of the years of reign of the originator as, e.g., emperor (anni imperii = imperial years), or king (anni regni = years of the king), and furthermore, the so-called 'indiction'. This indiction (also called Römerzinszahl [lit. 'Romans' interest numeral]) is one of the most frequent date determinations in the Middle Ages, but also a pretty strange one. Indiction "is the number that states the position of a year within a cycle of 15 years. These 15-year cycles run through our entire timeline" in the Middle Ages.⁴² The experts are not in agreement on the origin of this peculiar timeline; the indiction calculation however, as may be hinted here, is connected with the great forgery action.

We now mentally enter a medieval chancery, the one of Ludwig the German, and would like to have a look at how the civil servants furnished the documents of their rulers with date entries. We owe to P KEHR⁴³ for the thorough investigation of the ongoings in this chancery. What does he have to report to us? Over the years, LUDWIG's chancery was managed by varying chancery chiefs. "In every period of the chancery, there is one single scribe standing before us, next to him helpers or stand-ins." The reader is interested just whence KEHR's knowledge of the existence of these civil servants may originate. Well, from nothing else than the preserved documents of LUDWIG THE GERMAN's times themselves. From the individual variance of the hand-writing, from stylistic peculiarities, one concludes varying originators (scribes, text composers) of the documents. For some of these civil servants, one also knows, equally from the document itself, the name with which they signed

their pieces. In LUDWIG's documents, we find, e.g. the following names: ADALLEOD, DOMINICUS, COMEATUS, REGINBERT, HADEBERT, HEBARHARD.

The thorough combing through the preserved document stock has now uncovered monstrous things with regards to the mental quality of the document scribes. However, on ADALLEOD, we don't yet find out anything conspicuous from Kehr: "Despite the relatively large number of auxiliary scribes, he kept a tight order in the chancery." ... "He was a meticulous man, who also took the calculation of the year-attributes serious." In his documents, we detect a "flawless treatment of the dating". This stress on a "flawless" treatment already gives an idea that the other scribes of the chancery must also have produced mistakes also – occasionally, thinks the reader. Why, erring is human, in the Middle Ages, too. However, we begin wondering when we hear from DOMINICUS, not that he erred occasionally, but he went so wrong "that in the diplomas no.s 26 to 30, he" set "LUDWIG's reigning years too low by one". What? This civil servant erred in 5 consecutive diplomas in the entry of his ruler's years of reign? There is no denying, it is so. Let us listen further. Of COMEATUS und REGINBERT, we already hear worse. In their date entries, they went astray so massively that KEHR, e.g. in the case of REGINBERT, talks of a "chronological confusion". "The numbers in the documents written by him mock all determination." Now, the reader really gets a start, and he doesn't quite trust his eyes anymore, reading further on the famous REGINBERT, that he put his year numerals under the document "any which way it came into his head". (KEHR, p 53) It is undeniable, the documents prove it, he wrote his year numerals "any which way it came into his head"! Has the good scribe gone imbecilic or insane? Because this is no occasional human erring anymore! But halt! In some diplomas under COMEATUS-REGINBERT (both did work in the chancery at the same time!), the dating is correct also, such as in the pieces 32-37. Remarkable thing: temporarily, our scribes lose the insanity! We now come to a true luxury idiot in LUDWIG's chancery, and that is HEBARHARD.

Although his dating is correct on occasion (!), when he had to document again however, after a break of idling [absence], he "in the meantime lost the chronological thread", which, "for the period directly after, resulted in a complete dating confusion". Indeed, HEBARHARD behaves so oddly now in his dating, that one believes a 5-year old to be messing around in the chancery. Namely, in a whole group of documents, "the years of the King shows a difference of 7 years". In the face of such stupidity – because this couldn't be called human erring anymore with the utmost of goodwill – Kehr despondently says: "I believe that HEBARHARD, the higher the number of the reigning years went, the less he was able to cope with them, or, to put it simply, that he wasn't capable of counting up to 40." (p 102) Here, we have him again happily: the educated man from the Middle Ages who, under the influence of magical forces, morphs into an elementary pupil, nay, a retarded child of around 5 years, as soon as he approaches a desk to produce a document! Then, all of a sudden, these men weren't able to count up to 10 or 50 any longer! However, I haven't quite finished with HEBARHARD yet. This small child yet had moments in which it presented himself and behaved like an educated man. Namely once, when he, coincidentally, took the leisure to "contemplate how to get the documental chronology in order", and "he indeed succeeded". (p 102) So, he did it, after all!! But how did he succeed? KEHR reports: "Although the dating per se is incorrect (!), it is else in perfect order." This means: the enormous spirit of retardedness, our dear HEBARHARD, still doesn't have the correct date entries despite the contemplating, but by now, he has at least put some method to the madness!" –

The reader will agree with me how suitable it was to put the sentence of the "stupidity as the most reliable of all explanations" on top of this chapter. For the situation is now this: in the dating of "indubitably genuine" documents of LUDWIG THE GERMAN, there are monstrous mistakes to be found which one cannot possibly blame on mere accident or occasional oversight of the chancery's civil servants; however, research has to look for an explanation

for these phenomena; it was searching high and low, and finds as the most reliable explanation – the stupidity of medieval notaries. Stupidity in all honour, but what we are lumbered with here, in terms of medieval, educated men who have been raised in monastery and cathedral schools, is simply no longer tolerable. The expert scholars of course, find no fault with this explanation; as if it was dogma, they firmly believe in the outrageous stupidity of the medieval document civil servants. Why, by their methodical disposition, they have no other choice at all. Because those horrible spells of stupidity don't just occur occasionally, no, medieval documents show such attributes of their scribes in overwhelming abundance: so, that which is per se impossible, for the source researcher, it is fact and reality. And while in the previous chapters, I still found one helper in the crowd of experts who joined me in protesting the alleged "practical" forgers in the Middle Ages, by now, with regards to the dating nonsense in medieval diplomas, I stand there all alone in the wide world of documents. However, now it is important to show that such bottomless stupidity did not only blossom in the chancery of LUDWIG THE GERMAN.

"More frequent than spelling mistakes," – says BRESSLAU in his *DIPLOMATICAL SCIENCE* – "are those blunders in the dating which have sprung from calculating inexperience and from lacking adroitness in operating Roman numerals. They [the blunders] don't face us in the same manner during all periods of the Middle Ages; although they are barely ever missing completely during any period of the Middle Ages, they are yet most frequently [found] in the second half of the 9th and 10th, also still very frequently in the 11th century – a time, during which, indeed, the mathematical sense of certain document scribes, even in the Reich's chancery, was so flawed in its development, *as one would barely consider possible at all, had not the most accurate examination* of the Imperial documents *produced evidence to that effect in abundance*. It will suffice to show this a little more in detail with a few examples.

The chancery of LOTHAR I., which on the 24th of January 835, was still counting the 12th year of reign of the Emperor, switches on the 21st of February of that year to the 17th (!) year of reign, keeps that until the 7th of March, and then, from the 5th of May through to the end of 837, that is, throughout the period of two and a half years (!), the 18th year of reign." –

"Among the documents of OTTO I. are two irrefutable originals, which in all probability, belong to the years 955 and 956, furnished with the date entry 'anno incarnat. 976'." –

"Two original specimen, which are to be placed 30th March 948, are preserved of a document for Magdeburg from the same ruler, and their dating has been written by the same chancery civil servant. *Since the latter didn't exactly know the Christian Ärenjahr*, he first put down the hundreds, and later adds the tens and ones: in the one specimen 46, in the other 47 – that is, in two copies of one and the same document, differing from each other in the year numeral, and getting both wrong."

"In 5 German documents of the year 1036 under KONRAD II., the Imperial year on whose epoch day^{III} no doubt could have existed, was calculated to be one unit too small, and only correctly in one, and all the while, the Imperial year is in all documents of the year 1038 by one or two units too high.."

In the explanations on the diplomas HEINRICH II.⁴⁴, BRESSLAU presents still further examples:

"A further deviation of the norm is the fault of not one, but several scribes: after the notary Erich, on the 6th of December 1016, in document no. 1680, had returned to the correct year numeral 1016, one has kept this numeral also in the first months of the *following* year, and only on the 28th of April, entered the now correct numeral 1017. In the last two

III possibly 'epoch digit'? Epoch here denotes: in a chronology, the beginning of counting

documents of the year 1017, the wrong numeral 1016 makes yet another appearance, and in these diplomas, the notaries' insecurity in the years' calculation can clearly be traced." –

"The insecurity of the notary GB. is brightly lit, namely also by the repeatedly occurring post [as in 'after'] entries of (wrong) year numerals... One can downright claim that every time when the notary GB. returns to court and chancery business after a longer or shorter absence, the calculation by years of King and Emperor almost always falls into disorder... And as conspicuous the fact may be, that a man (the notary GB.) who temporarily carried out almost all of the work in the Imperial chancery, was unable to work out such simple arithmetic operations such as the correct calculation by years of reign had required – the fingers of both hands were enough for that calculation - *we have to accept this fact as final.*"

The impossible – it became an event here! One is to read the above examples twice, one is to read them three times, and thoroughly contemplate their content. We now want to mentally transfer ourselves to the court of HEINRICH II., respectively, into the Imperial chancery of the ruler. The factual head of the Imperial chancery was the *chancellor*. Under HEINRICH II., as chancellors are named: GUNTHER (until 1023) and UODALRICH. Supported by subordinate civil servants (notaries, scribes), the chancellor took care of current business. In terms of the distribution of the work, diplomatics have not quite reached clarity yet, allegedly, rigid order was not enforced in most of the cases. According to diplomatical findings, some documents must have been not only drafted, but also written by the chancellor, in other cases, the work of the chancellor was limited to the draft of the diploma, which was then issued by a notary (scribe). Very often, according to the findings, a document has not only been written, but also composed by one of the notaries. In such cases, the chancellor merely had to check the completed document, and to authorise it by his signature in the name of the Lord High Chancellor (recognition via the chancellor). As one of the most

often employed notaries in the Imperial chancery under HEINRICH II. appears GB. (the notaries and scribes are represented by letters, since their name is not always known). Next to GB., the following notaries, distinguishable by their hand-writing, turn up: Ba II, Ba III, Ba IV, GC, GD, GE, GF.⁴⁵ One thing can be pointed out here only in passing – the quite conspicuous change of staff in all medieval chanceries. For now, it shall suffice to mention the fact of frequent changes in staff. For example, the notary GB., too, was frequently absent from the chancery under HEINRICH II. During his first absence, the notaries GC and GD stand in for him, during the second absence, a standing-in of even the five (!) notaries GC, GD, GE, GF and HC has been concluded.

After this digression, I now return to the mentioned examples of faulty date entries in the medieval documents. Let us just take the last two examples. It is presented as an unshakeable fact there, that not only one notary, no, several scribes in HEINRICH's chancery did not know in which year they were living!! And this ignorance is not perhaps founded in accident or flightiness, no, the fact that one, after arduous correction of the year numeral since the 28th of April 1017, yet again, at the end of the year, used the wrong date 1016, shows in all clarity that the ignorance of the chancery staff is identical with pure stupidity! The frightening stupidity was commonplace not only in the chancery, because no scribe was able to correctly inform on the timeline calculation, and the chancellor, too, suffered from a temporary mental void. At times, not one man around the entire court must have correctly known how old he was, because the headless chancery civil servants, surely, would have approached their environment for advice on such burning, critical question. However, notary GB. must have been a downright idiot: if he had, only just and by the skin of his teeth, corrected the counting by years of King and Emperor, he very soon muddled everything up, he was unable to count up correctly by his ten fingers, couldn't find a colleague to help him a little with this, and still had the misfortune that his superior, the chancellor, couldn't make

heads or tails of the years of reign of the Emperor, either. Because in other cases, the chancellor checking the document would have intercepted the faulty specimen.

The prize for utmost stupidity and narrow-mindedness however, is hauled off by the chancery of Lothar I. (example 1). After their scribes, as late as 24th of January 835, count the 12th year of the Emperor's reign, on the 21st of February of the same year, they switch not perhaps to the 13th, but right away over to the 17th year, then, in their admirable simple-mindedness, they don't know how long a year takes, and, as early as the 5th of May, i.e. after barely two months, enter the 18th year of reign, and then loyally stick to, so as if to make up for the previous prematurity, the 18th year of reign throughout another two and a half years!

Indeed, it is difficult not to write a satire on these diplomatical "facts"! Why, no human being at all believes in such psychological "facts" – with the exception of the guilded diplomatists! And the document researchers would not hesitate a moment either to throw such fabulous "facts" overboard, if – yes, if – it weren't for the method! Why, BRESSLAU himself says that "one would barely consider it possible, if not the most accurate examination had produced evidence in abundance". And now, they refer to their empirical method of hand-writing comparison, founded on "eyesight evidence"; supported by this objective method, the "authenticity" of these documents, their genuine production in the chancery, has been determined "beyond doubt". Since therefore, the most accurate examinations have proven these documents to be originals, we are forced to accept the "barely possible" as indubitable fact. We, the other human beings however, argue thus: since the presented diplomatical results are simply psychologically impossible, directly contradict each and every experience, they can therefore not lay claim to historical truth and reality; furthermore must therefore the method be stuck with fundamental faults, and must thus be conceded [dropped]. The fault in the method must be found in its basis, in its objective foundation, in other words, in the diplomatical tradition. *The diplomatical tradition must be falsified in its entirety!*

8.

More proof for the alleged retardedness of medieval document scribes

The assumption of a universal forgery action towards the end of the Middle Ages becomes a probability and finally a certainty, simply by the evidential strength of the most varying sources of proof. And one does not have to strain themselves looking for proof: the great action has left its treacherous footprints everywhere in the mass of medieval tradition. In order to show, that the retardedness in all medieval chanceries was indeed epidemic, we follow-on with further evidence.

1. How the chancery civil servants of OTTO II. "erred" in dating their diplomas.

TH. VON SICKEL⁴⁶, whom we follow here, reports on documents which stem from the period of June through December 973. "The correct year of incarnation [973; insert by KAMMEIER] we find entered in only 11 documents, in 26 on the other hand, 974." So, it emerges under OTTO II. also, the peculiar phenomenon, that they could, all of a sudden, forget in which year they were living, after they had still known that yesterday, or the week before! Mind you, it was not an excusable mistake that occurred, but they must have been really thinking about this, these remarkable people because when they "erred", they just erred quite consistently, and constantly wrote, instead of 973, simply 974. "The routinely crept-in bad dating propagated". But strangely: "[...] the indictions appear relatively very correct [SICKEL's exact words! I'm just translating...]", because SICKEL reports of "a long series with correct indiction". Also, the year of the king is entered correctly in 32 documents! So, thank God, we may rest assured: according to this, OTTO's notaries were no imbeciles. This is shown also by

the fact "that on occasion of the changing year, it seems to have been noticed that so far, one had regularly set the year of incarnation by one too high. From then on, the chancery has counted correctly without exception". "Also, after the next new year's day, the year numeral then, quite correctly, is increased to 975." "Back then, the indiction has been calculated equally well." Here however, the cloven-foot shows up again already. Namely, SICKEL reports: "We have come to the hardly pleasing result that quite some insecurity had dominated in the calculation of the anni regni (years of the King)..., the same applies to the anni imperii" (= years of the Emperor). We are facing an important discovery here which however, has escaped the experts. Yes, we are catching the great action red-handed, directly at their work; the following forger trick has been employed: one time, one has the years of reign be "correct", and during this period, err in the years of incarnation, the other time, one "correctly" writes the years of incarnation, and during that period, errs in the years of reign. Why the forgers employed this trick here – and in some other places still – can be explained only at a later chapter of our investigation; here, these tactics are only pointed out.

In the meantime, we look around a little further in the chancery of OTTO II. From SICKEL, we find out on the date entries of the year 979, that suddenly, by the 978/79 turn of year "a bad confusion" takes hold which advertises itself by a "quite mechanical treatment of the dating". How horrible this confusion, and also, at the same time, the dumbness of the notaries was, we can see from the fact that for the year 979 "the numbers for the anni regni cover a range reaching from 13 to 25, and the anni imperii from 11 to 15". One has to just quietly contemplate these monstrosities, and then try and get their head around what was supposed to have happened in the chancery back then. Despite back then, "the notaries participating in the work were relatively many", no civil servant was able to say for how long their ruler had been reigning! One is to imagine Otto one day, asking his civil servants in the chancery, one after the other, that question. In the year 980, for a change, again is being "very

well dated". "Not even the numeral for the year of incarnation has been picked wrongly".

And thus, everything would be in order? No, because instead, other entries were not correct; e.g, one had thus "neglected" ... to increase the Roman interest numeral [indiction; insert by KAMMEIER] which was too low anyhow".

2. Retardedness of the notaries of HENRY III.

Here, we again refer to the examinations of P KEHR with regards to this chancery.⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that the head of the chancery, the chancellor, had "occasionally revised the documents, and performed corrections and additions". We also hear that notaries had helpers around them, and that they raise[d] pupils who carry on their tradition afterwards. For once, that does sound very sensible and promising. Unfortunately however, we experience yet another disappointment; because we have to hear that the notary "KA, who otherwise treats timeline elements most arbitrarily, too", is, "even with regards to the treatment of the Ärenjahre, of an incomprehensible carelessness". "AA, too, offers similarly confused timeline elements... Wrong indiction numerals are conspicuously frequent;" Why, even "with the otherwise correct GA, ... a certain insecurity in calculating the indiction shows". Eventually, one got so stuck in the chancery with regards to the years of the King, that KEHR's opinion is: "Perhaps operating with these big numbers [up to 20!!; insert by KAMMEIER] has ... grown too difficult for the men of that time? One could not get to grips with the year of ordination anymore". (p LXXIII.) Oh, the poor head of the chancery; temporarily he too, had no answer! No man did – temporarily. Because, o wonder, sometimes the wafts of retardedness dispersed from the rooms of the chancery, and then, the civil servants were able to name the year of ordination correctly again! But – "one has overlooked that again".

However, still of importance is now Kehr's finding, "that very often ... in the dating, the day and location entries are added later". "I count for certain: additions of the day in 63 originals, of the day and location in further 60 originals". And with this, we reach a new stage in our investigation. The question which now emerges is this: *should perhaps the mediæval document scribes also have "erred" on which day and at what location they issued their documents?* It has to be remarked here that the mediæval Emperors and Kings have much been travelling, marching for war, and then, also had the documenting done in the most varying places. The diplomatist denotes the succession of the stops on a travel route with the name *itinerary*. One rightfully expects now that the date entries in the documents of a ruler are in accordance with his itinerary, i.e., that in the date entry, that location is registered, at which the King was factually present at the indicated time.

Irreconcilability of day and location in the mediæval documents.

When we hear⁴⁸, that e.g. KONRAD II. had documents issued 1. one on 16. 1. 1032 in PADERBORN, 2. and 3. one on 18. 1. 1032 in FRITZLAR and HILWARTSHAUSEN respectively, it means that something cannot be right, because the distance HILWARTSHAUSEN – FRITZLAR amounts to 50 km [~ 30 miles], the distance PADERBORN – FRITZLAR 120 km. So, KONRAD could not have possibly stayed in PADERBORN on the 16th, and then, on the 18th, in FRITZLAR and HERWARTSHAUSEN. Time and again during the critical checking through of the document stock of the Emperors and Kings, one encountered contradictions between the known itinerary of a ruler and the data of their documents. One found that in many documents, the dating names locations at which a ruler has not stayed at the registered time, or in fact, ever at all. This had to cause astonishment, and indeed, diplomatists of name also, such as STUMPF, have swiftly declared those documents which are otherwise "irrefutable", to

be forgeries. Against this verdict, especially *JULIUS FICKER* (died 1902) stood up. He believed that he was able to save the authenticity of the documents in question by giving the following solution to the "mystery of the dating". Based upon the fact that the dating of medieval documents is introduced either by '*datum est*' (= given, issued), or by '*actum est*' (= negotiated), FICKER distinguishes two alternative ways of perceiving date entries in documents: the date of a diploma could state 1. on this day, and in this location, this document about a legal business [contract] has been issued, 2. on this day, and in this location, the legal act [fulfilment of the contract] registered in this document has taken place. So, in the first case, the date entry relates to the *issue* of the document, in the second one to the *legal act*. As a rule, FICKER further argues, the document has been written still on the same day, or surely, shortly afterwards in the same place at which the legal action had taken place, so legal action and document issue occur concurrently (= uniform dating); but it could also happen that after a legal business, a relevant document could not be issued immediately, and not in the location of the negotiation either, for various reasons, because the ruler had to continue his journey, so then, the chancery civil servant had no choice but to complete the document after days, weeks, or months, when the Emperor had already long stayed in a different place. So, in such a case, legal act and document issue occur separately (= non-uniform dating). May uniform dating be the rule, too, FICKER concluded, there is nonetheless non-uniform dating to be expected, and the seeming contradictions between the date entries in documents and the itinerary of the relevant ruler are explained by the fact that the document could not be issued on the day, or in the location of the negotiation.

Diplomatical research has accepted this, FICKER's, solution attempt as successful and very welcome, especially considering that one now had the satisfaction to be able to once again file in as genuine numerous Emperor and King documents, which could have been picked on only for the seeming contradictions with regards to the dates. FICKER was paid the

praise to have created, for the first time, the right clarity on the nature of the medieval document, by not perceiving it as something completed, but as something developing, and by researching their development. If one now takes a closer look at the heart of the affair, there may then not be all that much to default in the argumentation, instead however, there is all the more in FICKER's results. I will show that FICKER's hypothesis of the non-uniformity of the dating is unfit to satisfactorily explain the conspicuous contradictions between date entries in diplomas and the real itinerary of a ruler.

If FICKER distinguishes between "act" and "issue" ('actum' and 'datum'), such distinction per se is unobjectionable, it does not however, deserve any practical significance. Ficker himself had to concede already⁴⁹, that 'actum' in dating not at all always relates to the act, much like 'datum' does not always mean the issue (or handing out of the document), but that one expression oftentimes, in its meaning, interchanges with the other. Nowadays, there is no doubt about it, that *both expressions, in general, are handled quite arbitrarily*, and one chancery showed a leaning towards 'actum', another for 'datum'.

The majority of the German Emperor and King documents is dated *uniformly*, i.e. in date introductions with 'actum' as well as with 'datum', one was eyeing, in the overwhelming majority of the cases, one and the same point in time.⁵⁰ If one now bumps into contradictions between dates in a document and the real itinerary of the relevant King, the simplest solution to the riddle is, according to FICKER, that in exactly those cases, the reason is non-uniform dating. " In the predominantly relevant [I'm just translating] cases, the King stayed in the location, seemingly named by accident, before the time stated in the document.." ⁵¹ So, we will assume, that on 2nd September, a legal act took place before the King in A, adverse circumstances however, have prevented the immediate issue of the relevant document, the document could not have been issued before 30th October in B – then, the retarded scribe composed the date entry: given 30th October in A. Naturally, on 30th October, the King was

not in A, but, as his itinerary states, in B. The contradiction of the itinerary with the date however, is merely fictional, because it exists only under the premise that the dating would have to be uniform. One has to simply join Ficker and the majority opinion that non-uniform dating was applied – and a contradiction no longer exists!

It is embarrassing how little sound common sense is applied in diplomatical and historical examinations, and just how tall the order addressed to us is, to accept as historical reality the psychologically impossible and everything contradicting experience. It is most telling, that the historians and diplomatists, in all seriousness, want to make us believe that throughout the Middle Ages, up to the verge of modern times, our ancestors would have been semi-idiots. Why, since the core of all historical tradition is supposed to be "indubitably" "authentic", historical and diplomatical research is unable to explain the countless peculiarities and riddles, met every step along the journey, any other way than by the imputation that the mental disposition of medieval document and history scribes had been so raw, primitive, undefinable, helpless, as is nowadays not even met in the average school youth of halfway civilised people. One mustn't misunderstand me. The level of knowledge in the Middle Ages sure was considerably lower than in our days^{IV}, no human doubts that [no kidding!]. There was only one school education of the clerical cast, and this education may have been fairly modest at least. But it is not this content-related side of the medieval spirit, but much rather the *formal* side of spiritual life with which we are concerned. The historical-diplomatical science now expects us to believe that in the Middle Ages, even amongst the best educated classes of the population at large, the formal mental powers, what one would, short and to the point, call mother smarts, inborn cleverness, was so primitively developed, "that one would barely consider it possible", if not solid evidence to that stupidity was facing

IV Right there!!! A glimpse at the very heart of the entire affair! I, quite opposed to KAMMEIER on this rarest of occasions, argue that people knew much more of what was worth knowing back then than we do nowadays, being merely carriers of completely useless (mostly harmful, actually) 'knowledge' which we 'believe' to make us 'intelligent persons' – the 'matrix' we've been stuck in for so long.

us in abundance in the diplomatical and literary testimonies. We have already met such evidence of stupidity in the faulty date entries of "genuine" documents, we will now meet further evidence, and continue doing so during the course of our examinations.

Once more, I will now turn to FICKER's attempt to eradicate from existence the contradictions between date entries of certain documents and the itinerary of a ruler by the hypothesis of non-uniform dating. If this solution were to work correctly, i.e. the diplomas in question were to be genuine, one could not help but rate the mental qualities of a whole range of medieval chancery chancellors extraordinarily lowly. I refer to the mentioned example, in which a notary was able to complete the document on a legal act having taken place in A on 2nd September, due to adverse circumstances, only on 30th October in B. Once he had, aided by the draft or other papers, written down the text of the diploma, the notary sets out to put the date line below the text. So, he writes down: "given" ('actum' or 'datum') – then he notices that today is the 30th October, thus adds: "on 30th October" – and then, just in time, remembers that the act had of course taken place in A, so he carries on writing: "in A". So, our notary, in his innocent spirit, does not realise at all that with his date line ("given 30th October in A), he has written down some coarse nonsense, that he is throwing together the most contradictive entries! Because whichever way one may take the introducing 'actum' or 'datum', (1. "negotiated on 30th October in A", 2. "issued 30th October in A", the way the date line reads, it contains in itself a flat out contradiction. That such sense-defying date entry can accidentally flow out of a scribe's pen, is not being denied, but that such anti-sense has been written down in numerous cases, consciously and deliberately, must quite decidedly be denied. The medieval notaries and chancellors, too, had to concede the nonsense in such dating, and when it occurred to them, they were able to, without excessive mental gymnastics, find a dating formula which correctly and perfectly clearly expressed the state of affairs. So, the scribe in our example could have written: "negotiated on 2nd September in A,

issued on 30th October in B" – and if else the chancery civil servants in the Middle Ages hadn't been semi-idiots but in possession of some common sense, there can't be any doubt that they, in these exceptional cases of act and issue occurring separately, would have composed the dating formula in this, the only correct, manner. Why, there are also cases known really "not all that rarely", "which, explicitly for act and issue, contain repeated and different entries for time and location in the documents themselves".⁵²

On the basis of calling upon reason and experience, documents with the described contradictions in the date line, or with similar peculiarities in the data – if e.g. two documents of the same originator with identical date entries name different locations, which are irreconcilable with the itinerary – are to be declared forgeries. These forgeries could not have sprung from practical-materialistic motives.

These fake pieces, too, are discharge of the late medieval, learned universal history falsification enterprise.

9.

The root cause of the chronological muddle in the medieval documents

In the previous chapter, we have uncovered a new shameful manifestation with regards to the mental state of medieval document scribes: these men "erred" not only in the timeline attributes, but also in stating location [and] current day [day x of month y, presumably]. Or much rather, if we consult, after the example of the experts, the "most reliable of

explanations", we have thus to admit: much like these civil servants of medieval chanceries were temporarily unable to correctly count up to 20, they were temporarily equally unable to put location and day under their documents in a way in which these two entries would have been in perfect accordance. Because in that point, they haven't blundered occasionally, no, research had to register masses of such cases of so-called *non-uniform* dating from across the different centuries. Instead of a long list of such cases, which would fill a small book⁵³, only a few more examples are mentioned in order to show how the experts have learned to accept such "facts".

H BLOCH⁵⁴ writes: "Even a complete layman will have no trouble understanding that KONRAD II. could not have documented [issued documents] on the 17th January 1035 to TILLEDA in the GOLDENE AUE, and on the same day, around 450 km [just under 300 miles] away from there, to LIMBURG ON THE HARDT". BLOCH is quite right; such thing, even the greenest rookie can grasp. KONRAD could not have possibly given order to issue one document in TILLEDA, and one in LIMBURG on one and the same day. Nonetheless, the two documents with the same day entry and the different location entries do exist, and we are curious as to how BLOCH throws some light on the story. "Namely, the documents are tightly connected, the [legal] acts of both belong to the January to TILLEDA; but the second document, issued to the LIMBURG monastery, was decreed from the start to be enacted and issued only in the summer of 1035, at the consecration of the church; on that occasion, the name of the location has been added as a late entry..., also the numeral for the year of the Emperor has been correctly worked out." This bold explanation attempt of BLOCH, in the ears of the diplomatists who, since Ficker, are used to such interpretation, sounds so inconspicuous, that for them, every problem has vanished. And thank God, in the many cases of non-uniform dating, the diplomatists always find some such "solution". However, we now want to remind ourselves that "non-uniformity in the dating" means nothing other than that in

those documents, the document scribes, in plain English, wrote down nonsensical date entries. Because the date entry in the Limburg diploma is, and remains, nonsensical; "LIMBURG, the 17th January 1035" was, and remains, a monstrosity, since on the 17th, KONRAD was not in LIMBURG at all, but in TILLEDA. After all, Bloch cannot magic away this coarse blunder, he merely tries to explain how the document scribe may have arrived at such nonsense. And now we take a mental trip to TILLEDA where on the 17th January, our notary has documented. Two things were negotiated, two documents had to be produced. So, first, our notary wrote the piece for TILLEDA, he completed it altogether, and furnished it with the correct date entry: Tilleda, the 17th January 1035. Then he started the diploma for Limburg, and completed it almost, and even put below it already: the 17th January. However, now came the order to temporarily not issue this Limburg diploma; much rather, it was meant to be completed and issued – always going by BLOCH's argumentation – only later, during summer in LIMBURG. And then, when he was with KONRAD in LIMBURG in the summer, what did our notary do? He simply put next to the 17th January: LIMBURG – and now, something completely nonsensical stood there! Perhaps he was thoughtless in the conduct of his work? Oh no, as we have already heard, he worked out the year of the Emperor correctly which had changed in the meantime! So, he stands before us again, the by now well-known man from the Middle Ages who utters the biggest nonsense and thinks quite rationally, both at the same time. Had our notary have his regular Joe-Blog smarts do the job, he would have written in TILLEDA: actum (negotiated) the 17th January in TILLEDA. And then, in the summer in LIMBURG, he would have naturally, as if it goes without saying, continued his document thus: datum (issued) on this and that day in this and that month in Limburg – and everything was, without brain-racking – perfectly right.

But now, the diplomatists storm against me and shout: yes, we sensible people of today, we act as sensibly – but you mustn't explain the past by the present in this case,

because the bottom line is that medieval people simply did not act sensibly; when they forged documents, or when they wrote "genuine" documents, they especially did the least understandable! Permit me! Only a diplomatist, no other human in the world, can believe in such sensible-insensible ninnies of the Middle Ages! After all, those date entries were no difficult thing over which to rack one's brains; but instead, and the experts, too, will have to concede this, trains of thought which elementary pupils manage with playful ease. But of course, if one is professionally used to having at hand human stupidity as the most reliable of all explanations, one can of course grant our ancestors, educated in our cathedral and monastery schools, not even the educational level of an elementary pupil. And FICKER's quite highly praised discovery of the "non-uniform" dating is nothing other than an attempt to explain the bottomless human stupidity of medieval document scribes. Desperately, the experts now defend themselves with their last weapon: but the "genuine" documents prove it black on white, and in countless cases, that the notaries in the Middle Ages have really been such semi-idiot! The documents which one cannot deny away, do prove their stupidity! – The response here is that the documents with the so-called non-uniform (in plain English: nonsensical) date entries prove something, indeed: *namely, that they are forgeries*. Creations from the great action, that is. That is quite strikingly proven, and now in *this* genre also, by the again discovered peculiar mental state of medieval document scribes. Three times so far, we have discovered this medieval human being with this absolute equal and absolute impossible mental state, first in form of the alleged "practical" forger, then in the masquerade of the "genuine" document scribe who was unable to count up to 20, and finally, cloaked as the "genuine" scribe who was unable to reconcile location and day. All documents which imply this impossible medieval person, are results of the late medieval universal forgery action.

We have reached a stop in our investigation at which it can no longer be avoided to concern ourselves with a quite certain side and peculiarity of the great forgery enterprise; in doing so, we must anticipate, a little, the extensive description of the nature and originator of the universal action from a later part of this here work.

The experts of the guilded source research suffer from a typical narrowing of the mental horizon, so that they do *not* notice especially the important and most important things. With their well dimmed down research lantern, they shine a light here and there, and cannot recognise the larger context. It is now also owed to this narrow view that they could have overlooked two most conspicuous and treacherous attributes in the physiognomy of medieval tradition. Namely, the following phenomenon: in the entire tradition of the Middle Ages – that is, equally strong in the diplomatical and in the literary series – *a great insecurity, nay, a downright helplessness in the entries of dates and names* makes itself noticeable. On no other point is history so insecure, full of contradictions, and faulty, as it is in stating numbers. We have already had heaps of evidence pass us by, by the "practical" forger workshops and chanceries of the Emperors and Kings, and in the second part, too, examples will be produced in abundance. Of course, the experts, too, see those things, but they see a thousand isolated dots, and not the line formed by these dots. Straining themselves, they look for a thousand individual reasons, whereas of course, the conspicuous phenomenon has to be traced to one and the same general cause: the great forgery action.

Now however, a big question is standing up before us: *Then how come that in the medieval enterprise, which sure must have been a planful one, such mistakes and contradictions, the way we meet them, for example, in the documents of the Kings, could have happened?* Where does the muddle in the chronology come from? Shouldn't one have to assume that the highly educated forgery association of the late Middle Ages payed quite particularly keen attention to the chronology? Indubitably, one will have to assume that.

Indubitably, the renaissance forgers will have struggled most tenaciously with the problem of the chronology. But now we want to give ourselves a clear picture of the situation in which the forgery association found itself when it set out to implement its enormous plan.

The task of the late medieval, learned forgery guild did not consist of, here and there, slipping in a forged piece into the else untouched, genuine tradition, because in that way, the ultimate objective of the enterprise would not be accomplished; *much rather, the task consisted of re-casting the entire German medieval past according to a certain basic plan, and then, to re-shape it anew from scratch.* The actual tradition, the way it existed, has met little courtesy in this re-casting and re-creating. Crucial was alone the new blueprint prescribed by the association, according to whose draft the reinstatement was carried out. Mercilessly, all stock of the original tradition has been torn down, changed, or completely pushed aside. On this newly chaotic [void] surface, an enormous pseudo-historical structure has been erected. The true building of our German medieval history, the way it once stood, has been torn down, and its single pieces have been partly recycled for the reinstatement, partly destroyed. It was a new spiritual architecture that was crucial to the forgers. The old architecture, the national-germanic blueprint of medieval history, was not to the forgers liking. Of course, the centre of gravity of medieval history had to be shifted from the Germanic to the Roman world. Thus, in the place of the real tradition, towards which the originators of the enterprise were indifferent because it was unfit for use as required "historical proof" for their theological and political theories, a new, largely invented historical world was placed. *The tradition today, the way it is now presented to us in literary and diplomatical testimonies of the early Middle Ages, on the whole predominantly represents nothing other than a historically buffed multi-volume purpose novel, in which a large proportion of the persons and events are either re-cast parts of real history, or completely invented facts.*

In order to return to our special subject, that means: **The entire chronology of the early German Middle Ages has also been re-cast, changed, newly founded and invented.** Of course, it already follows from the term 'universal action' that the entire chronology, too, had to be involved in the process of re-casting and re-creating. The forgers found themselves pressed to modify all timeline determinations, or freely invent them, respectively. Because the chronology represents the supporting skeleton of the history that is to be created anew.

The question: how could the forgers of the associate action allow for such gross chronological mistakes – the way we met them e.g. in the dating of the documents of the Kings – despite working according to a plan? finds its answer with the hint at the extraordinarily difficult situation in which they had been. One is to put oneself into their shoes. A *genuine* chronological frame was factually no longer extant for the forgers; genuine time line determinations could only be used inasmuch they proved fit for use in the new blueprint of the history that was to be created. So, the task was to give almost the entire chronology through all the centuries of the Middle Ages a new foundation, which lead to inventing timeline determinations from thin air. The association had to operate on the large scale much like the Viennese forger of the *FABELFÜRSTENREIHE* was operating in his data series on a small scale. *However, this creation of the new medieval chronology, as it were, out of nothing, was the most difficult part of the universal action, and to that part, has of course miserably failed.* Naturally, the monstrous difficulty was this: there was not merely a new series of numbers of the German Kings and Emperors to be plotted; still many more data series had to be thought up, e.g. series of German Dukes and Princes; furthermore, data series of foreign rulers (e.g. Italian) had to be reconciled with the new German series. Nonetheless, the different data series had to be interlocked with clockwork-like precision. That, the forgers failed to achieve, and it was, in the face of towering difficulties, never going to be achieved. The continual interlocking and connecting of the most varied events with regards to their

chronological fixation, the continual crossing of so many pseudo-historical event threads and their data series – this interlocking, to the forgers' dismay, resulted, time and again, in the demolition of the so laboriously carpentered chronological frame in its weak spots. These breaking points now had to subsequently be patched up. For this breaking-point-patching-up, a special procedure was invented: wherever the interlocking of date entries did not exactly fit, one took refuge to pulling the predicament stop *elastic dating*. This elastic dating works thus: every time the forgers encountered difficulties in exactly fixing the date entries, they helped themselves by, *in a manner of speaking, deliberately swinging to and fro between several time attributes of the event to be documented*. In such a case⁵⁵, one stated e.g. as year of incarnation 740, as year of indiction 741, as year of the King 744. With full deliberation, such an event was left in a state of chronological suspension. Over the course of the later investigation – in the second part - we will often return to this forgers' trick, and we will then also meet numerous other predicament remedies, which the association was using in order to hide the constantly growing number of cracks in the number frame. For now, the general reference may suffice that all the monstrous date entries in the medieval documents of the Kings have been written down *in full deliberation*, since the forgers of the great enterprise, in facing the impossibility of fixing events with razor-sharp exactitude, had no other refuge than to give date entries *by approximation*, or leave them in chronological suspense. Thus, the phenomenon of the mysterious chronological muddle in the medieval documents is explained by the impossibility, on the part of the late medieval forgery association, to give the invented data series a foundation for an error-free chronological frame.

Endnotes

Abbreviations:

MIÖG = Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichte [Messages of the Institute for Austrian History]

NA = Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde [New Archive of the Society for older German Historical Science]

1 E Kenser – Die Geschichtswissenschaft [Historical Science]. 1931, p 17
 2 Comp MIÖG 47, p 329/30
 3 View NA 46, p 168 f
 4 "Papsttum u. Kaisertum" [Papedom and Emperordom] (1926), p 116
 5 NA 37, p 55
 6 NA 37, p 778
 7 NA 50, p 160
 8 Vol. 16, p 103 and 114
 9 NA 48, p 117
 10 MIÖG 42, p 28
 11 MIÖG 42, p 312
 12 Hist. Vierteljahresschrift [Historical Quarterly] 16, p 10
 13 NA 49, p 587
 14 Hist. Vierteljahresschrift 27, p 472
 15 H Breßlau – Urkundenlehre [Document Science] Vol. 1, p 14, footnote 3
 16 H Hoffmann – Karl der Große [Charles the Great] (1919), p 78 and 80
 17 Archiv für Urkundenforschung [Archive for Document Research] Vol. 2, p 188f.
 18 R Köpke – Hrotsuit v. Gandersheim, p 259
 19 MIÖG 32, p 391
 20 MIÖG 47, p 135
 21 Historische Zeitschrift [Historical Magazine] 47, p 45
 22 H Breßlau – Urkundenlehre Vol. 1, p 11
 23 MIÖG 47, p 142
 24 Archiv für Urkundenforschung, V, p 54
 25 Ergänzungsheft zu den Stimmen der Zeit [Supplement to the contemporary voices] 2nd series, 3rd issue, p 232
 26 Brandi – Die Reichenauer Urkundenfälschungen [The Reichenau Document forgeries], 1890
 27 MIÖG 9, p 225/26
 28 MIÖG 21, p 28ff.
 29 MIÖG 47, p 237f.
 30 Already translated
 31 Comp. p 22
 32 See note p 26
 33 Note p [there, the entry stops]
 34 Brandi, a.a.O., p 51
 35 Lechner a.a.O., p 41
 36 P Kehr – Fälschungen für Helmarshausen [Forgeries for H.], NA 49, p 99 [Again, there, the entry is truncated]
 37 In "Quellen und Forschungen aus italienisch. Archiven u. Biblioth." [Sources and Research from Italian Archives and Libraries] 14 (1911)
 38 Nachrichten der Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaft. Göttingen, 1904, p 471
 39 A Dopsch – in MIÖG XVII, p 1ff.
 40 W M Peitz – Untersuchungen zu Urkundenfälschungen des Mittelalters [Examinations on Document Forgeries of the Middle Ages] (Ergänzungsheft zu den Stimmen der Zeit), 2nd series, 3rd issue, 1919
 41 MIÖG 12th Supplement Volume (1933), p 436
 42 Grotefend – Zeitrechnung des Mittelalters [timeline of the Middle Ages], 1891
 43 NA 50, p 1-105
 44 Comp. NA, Vol. XVI, p 413f.
 45 View NA, Vol. XVI, p 413ff.
 46 MIÖG, Supplement Vol. 2, p 77f.
 47 Monumenta Germaniae historica, 5. Diplomataband [Volume of Documents], part 2
 48 Hist. Vierteljahresschrift 16, p 11
 49 I Ficker – Beiträge zur Urkundenlehre [Contributions to Diplomatical Science], p 60ff.
 50 H Breßlau – Urkundenlehre I, 1, p 850f.
 51 F Philippi – Einführung in d. Urkundenlehre [Introduction to Diplomatics], p 14
 52 H Breßlau – Urkundenlehre I, 1, p 860, footnote 1
 53 MIÖG, Supplement Vol. 6, p 11
 54 Hist. Vierteljahresschrift 16, p 12
 55 Comp. e.g. NA 39, p 275